

10-1-1993

Theory and research in social education 21/04

National Council for the Social Studies. College and University Faculty Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/coedu_pub

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

National Council for the Social Studies. College and University Faculty Assembly, "Theory and research in social education 21/04 " (1993). *College of Education Publications*. Paper 79.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/coedu_pub/79

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Education Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Theory & Research *in Social Education*

Volume XXI Number 4 Fall 1993

In This Issue...

FEATURES

Sandra J. LeSourd

Selected Children's Representations
of People in Five Countries

Kathy Bickmore

Learning Inclusion/Inclusion in
Learning: Citizenship Education for
a Pluralistic Society

BOOK REVIEWS

A special section devoted to reviews of
the *Handbook of Research on Social
Studies Teaching and Learning*.

Reviews in this issue by Martha Rapp
Ruddell, D. Rosalind Hammond, and
Ted W. Freeman (Part 2 of a series).

THEORY AND RESEARCH IN SOCIAL EDUCATION

Volume XXI

Number 4

Fall, 1993



The Official Journal of the
College and University Faculty Assembly
of the National Council for the Social Studies

TRSE is the official journal of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies. Published quarterly, it is a general review open to all social studies educators, social scientists, historians, and philosophers. A general statement of purpose may be found with submission, subscription, and advertising information at the end of the journal. © 1993 by the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies. All rights reserved.

THEORY AND RESEARCH IN SOCIAL EDUCATION

Editor: Jack R. Fraenkel
Book Review Editor: Perry Marker
Assistant Editor: Mary V. Grant
Editorial Assistant: Jean Cheng

Theory and Research in Social Education (ISSN 0093-3104) is published quarterly by the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies. Membership is \$20.00 per year, \$15.00 of which is allocated for subscription to *TRSE*. Institutional and non-CUFA subscriptions are \$35.00 per year. Second-class postage is paid at Washington, D.C., and additional offices. Back issues may be obtained for \$10.00 each when available. Postmaster: Send address changes to *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 3501 Newark Street, NW, Washington, DC 20016.

Address manuscripts and letters to the editor to:

Dr. Jack R. Fraenkel
Research and Development Center
Burk Hall 238
School of Education
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94132

Address book reviews to:

Dr. Perry Marker
School of Education
Sonoma State University
1801 E. Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Address correspondence related to permissions, subscription and membership, back issues, and change of address to:

Membership Department
National Council for the Social Studies
3501 Newark Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Address correspondence about advertising to:

Peter Stavros, Meetings and Marketing, at the NCSS address.

REVIEWER ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The editors would like to thank the following individuals for their time and for the attention they gave to the manuscripts they reviewed for this issue and upcoming issues of *TRSE*.

Susan Adler
Janet Alleman
Christine Bennett
Don Bragaw
Alan Brandhorst
Margaret Branson
Jere Brophy
June Chapin
Jeff Cornett
Lee Ehman
Ron Evans
Jean Fair
Jeffrey Fouts
Richard Gross
Michael Hartoonian
Marilyn Johnston
William Joyce
Nancy King
Guy Larkins
Margaret Laughlin
James Leming

Linda Levstik
Andra Makler
Peter Martorella
George Mehaffy
Merry Merryfield
Geoff Milburn
Jack Nelson
Murry Nelson
Stuart Palonsky
Valerie Pang
Paul Robinson
Wayne Ross
David Saxe
Mary Soley
Lynda Stone
Stephen Thornton
Steve Thorpe
Jan Tucker
Bruce VanSledright
Rahima Wade

Volume XXI
Number 4
Fall, 1993

IN THIS ISSUE...

Editorial	311
Letter to the Editor	312

FEATURES

Sandra J. LeSourd	Selected Children's Representations of People in Five Countries	316
Kathy Bickmore	Learning Inclusion/Inclusion in Learning: Citizenship Education for a Pluralistic Society	341

BOOK REVIEWS

A special section devoted to reviews of the <i>Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning</i> . Reviews in this issue by Martha Rapp Ruddell, D. Rosalind Hammond, and Ted W. Freeman (Part 2 of a series).		385
Information for Authors		407

Editorial

In this issue, we present the second (and final) set of reviews of selected chapters from the *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning*.

Our features include an interview study of how a group of 24 10- and 13-year-olds described diverse peoples and countries, and what this suggests about the meanings these children brought to their investigation; and a qualitative analysis of how identical curricular guidelines were implemented differently in two secondary school world studies classrooms. Both articles present informative accounts of the roles context and experience play in the construction of meaning. We hope you'll find the work of these authors interesting and enlightening.

As always, we encourage reactions to the articles we publish. In addition, I want to remind our readers of the special themes we have planned for future issues of *TRSE*: "Gender, Feminism, and Social Studies Education" (Jane Bernard-Powers as guest editor); "Foundations of Social Studies Education" (David Saxe as guest editor); and "Multicultural Issues in Social Education" (Valerie Pang and George Mehaffy as guest editors). If you would like to submit a manuscript for consideration in a special theme issue, please send it directly to the appropriate guest editor(s). (Be sure to follow the manuscript submission guidelines included in the "Information for Authors" section at the end of the journal.)

Jack R. Fraenkel
November, 1993

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dr. Jack Fraenkel
Editor, *Theory and Research in Social Education*
Burk Hall 238
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94132

Dear Dr. Fraenkel:

Mr. William Wraga's recent piece in *TRSE* (Summer, 1993) on the necessity of interdisciplinary curricula for the preparation of students' civic competence was superb; that is, until the final two sections. I was left wondering if Mr. Wraga was arguing for (a) a societal problems and issues curriculum that is interdisciplinary in design or (b) an interdisciplinary curriculum that may or may not highlight societal problems and issues. The initial thrust of his argument, with which I agree, essentially involves the following line of reasoning.

Developing students' civic competence in a democracy is an essential goal of the social studies, the rationale(s) for which have been articulated by others. A central feature of civic competence is the ability to identify, research, analyze, and act upon current societal problems and to identify, research, and analyze problems from the past that reflect persistent core value conflicts. Because understanding and resolution of most social problems and issues draw upon information and ideas from multiple disciplines, the social studies curriculum to some extent must necessarily assume an interdisciplinary character.

In effect, Mr. Wraga has argued that interdisciplinary study is justified because of the complex, messy, far-reaching nature of most social issues and problems past and present. To eliminate a focus on social issues and problems would require interdisciplinary advocates, Mr. Wraga included, to find alternative rationales for their preferred curricular structure. Mr. Wraga is very aware of this tight and necessary relationship, and therefore painstakingly documents (pp. 205-211) the long tradition of advocates of a societal issues-based curriculum, including the 1916 NEA Committee, Dewey (1927), Oliver and Shaver (1966), Hunt and Metcalf (1968), Engle and Ochoa (1988), and Evans (1992).

In fairness to Mr. Wraga, he does imply a second, alternative rationale for interdisciplinary study on p. 202; that is, it ensures opportunities for the "application and synthesis of knowledge"; however, since application and synthesis activities take place regularly among scholars working within single disciplines, and because the cognitive acts of application and synthesis can occur with the same degree of regularity in single-discipline social studies classroom, this rationale seem unpersuasive. Stated another way, interdisciplinary classrooms do not have a monopoly on thoughtfulness in theory and need not in practice. Mr. Wraga does not need a second rationale, as his version of promoting citizenship and civic competence (i.e., working through societal issues/problems) is sufficient to secure a significant place for interdisciplinary study in the social studies curriculum.

So far so good. But when reading the concluding two sections of this otherwise fine piece of scholarship, I was surprised and disappointed to see a number of recommendations for interdisciplinary curricula that appear to have lost their mooring in societal problems and issues. On p. 222, Mr. Wraga suggests that an interdisciplinary curriculum could be constructed by identifying "appropriate *connections* [my emphasis] between courses (e.g., between world history and world literature, geography and earth science, U.S. history and American literature, economics and mathematics) and teachers would encourage students to recognize these connections explicitly." A similar interdisciplinary recommendation on p. 222 is made involving subjects contained only within the field of social studies: "A world history course that systematically examines the history, geography, economy, politics, social organization and culture of particular civilizations is another example of this kind of organization." *Connection making* organized around topics (in this example, various civilizations) rather than social problems and issues suddenly emerges as the driving force behind curricular design. Furthermore, isn't a topical, broad-coverage, loosely defined, connection-making approach to historical study representative of much classroom practice today, and an approach that Mr. Wraga clearly rejects in earlier sections of his article?

Mr. Wraga then offers a second, alternative suggestion for interdisciplinary curricula on pp. 222-223 that involves integrating science and social studies to "*shed light* [my emphasis] on science-related historical developments (e.g., the development of technology and its impact on humankind...." Here the rationale for interdisciplinary curricular design seems to be *light shedding*—in this example, developments in applied science over time and their impact on society. Isn't this still pretty much standard instructional fare despite the fact that science is now infused into the social studies curriculum; that is, teachers continue to select a topic, theme, movement, or idea and illuminate for students its changing status, evolution, or impact over time? And even if

it is not standard fare, what has happened to student decision making about contemporary or persistent societal issues and problems?

The problem with both of the above curricular suggestions is that (a) new purposes are offered for interdisciplinary study without articulating their supporting rationales, and (b) shifting the purpose of interdisciplinary study to connection making and light shedding is likely to result in exactly what Mr. Wraga wants to avoid; that is, integration and illumination as ends in and of themselves. He quotes Hunt and Metcalf on exactly this point (p. 210). The curriculum should "not integrate for the sake of integration." Instead, one should cross "subject-matter boundaries for the express purpose of addressing life problems not confined to a single discipline" (pp. 210-211). In fairness to Mr. Wraga, he does return to his problems-issues rationale for interdisciplinary study when suggesting a third format on pp. 222-223 ("Social studies subject matter can also be integrated with science subject matter...to examine science-related societal issues").

I make the above criticism not because I am a latter-day Paul Hirst or Phillip Phoenix attempting to resurrect the sanctity of the disciplines. Rather, I am concerned that too few classrooms involve the serious exchange of ideas and the cultivation of what TedSizer, Richard Paul, and many others call thoughtful and critical "habits of mind."

In fact, interdisciplinary study can make classroom thoughtfulness less likely. Social studies teachers, for a variety of reasons, often lack sufficient understanding to critically explore with their students many important ideas and issues associated with their chosen field or discipline and addressed in their own courses. Yet advocates of interdisciplinary curricula now propose that teachers gain mastery of additional fields of study and integrate these fields into their courses (and usually without increasing teachers' daily preparation time or providing release time to do so). The result is typically an even larger body of content, with more superficial teacher understanding and classroom discourse than before.

Focusing teaching and student thought on specific issues and problems, as Mr. Wraga argues initially, rather than on more encompassing topics or disciplines will help to delimit a propensity for expanded content coverage. In addition, an issues and problems focus will help delimit didactic teaching, reduce the heavy emphasis on single-interpretation story telling through the ages, and direct classroom activity toward student analysis and decision making.

At a time when a variety of curricular frameworks are being advocated and implemented (e.g., history based, geography based, interdisciplinary spanning the social studies, multidisciplinary spanning all disciplines, multicultural, Afrocentric, western civilization based/Eurocentric, etc.), it is imperative that the rationale(s) undergirding each be argued. Mr. Wraga may be able to provide other

rationales for interdisciplinary structuring of social studies lessons, units, and courses. Whether or not he wants to, what these rationales are, and how persuasive they are remains unclear. Until Mr. Wraga and others articulate these rationales, it seems that societal problems and issues must continue to guide the design of interdisciplinary curricula.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Onosko
University of New Hampshire

SELECTED CHILDREN'S REPRESENTATIONS OF PEOPLE IN FIVE COUNTRIES

Sandra J. LeSourd
California State University, Fresno

Abstract

Twenty-four 10- and 13-year-old children of low socioeconomic level and of Hispanic, Asian, African American, and white ethnic heritage were shown photos of people in five different countries and were asked open-ended questions to elicit certain data. Interview procedures were first piloted, then revised questions were used to generate representations from the participants. Data were aggregated and compared across photos, age, and linguistic/cultural subgroups to answer the following research questions: (a) How can children's representations of countries and people be described? (b) What cultural information is included in their representations? (c) What qualities of representation are associated with age? (d) What qualities of representation are associated with variety in children's own linguistic/cultural experience? Overall, representations were characterized by emphasis upon austere conditions and hardships in life and the human need for security. Ten-year-olds elaborated primarily upon the thoughts and feelings of people, while 13-year-olds included more knowledge abstracted to country level. A minor substantive difference was noted among groups differentiated by linguistic/cultural background.

Introduction

At the present time, there is insufficient description of the mental representations about social and cultural phenomena that children bring to the classroom and activate during formal instruction. There is a need to explore children's schema for social and cultural life so that curriculum and instruction can be founded upon an empirical base (Armento, 1986; Levstik & Pappas, 1992; Torney-Purta, 1991). There is little previous research about children's knowledge of cultural diversity and their images of the lives of people in other countries; thus, the major purpose of this study was to provide the opportunity for

children to talk about diverse people and their countries and to document the salient qualities in their representations of them. A second purpose was an attempt to discover if the participants' representations of diverse people and countries varied in relation to their own age or to the linguistic and cultural diversity within their own life experience.

Research founded upon a developmental paradigm of learning may be useful for interpreting children's representations of various countries and peoples. The widely accepted principle that individuals mature through successive stages of cognitive and moral reasoning may help explain qualitative differences between age levels (Reimer, Paolitto & Hersh, 1983; Rosenzweig, 1982). If so, we can expect young learners' representations to be inhibited or incomplete in contrast to adolescents and adults who have reached levels of cognition that permit abstract and principled reasoning.

It has been suggested that children are most receptive to learning about other cultures at the age of approximately 8 to 12 (Cushner, 1988; Kobus, 1983). Before age 8, a tendency toward egocentrism dominates and after 12, a propensity to stereotype affects objectivity (Cushner, 1988). The findings about stereotyping seem to belie the developmental paradigm that presumes that individuals capable of reasoning in hypothetical terms have an increased capacity for objectivity in their evaluations of people (Alleman & Rosaen, 1991).

Research into the qualitative differences between beginning and expert understandings and into the development of the ability to explain scientific phenomena has introduced the concept of domain-specific, radical restructuring of knowledge (Carey, 1985; Vosniadou & Brewer, 1987). According to this theory, change in knowledge that occurs with age and expertise actually constitutes emerging new and different explanations and restructuring of important concepts out of previous ontological understandings; that is, experts construct a new theory to explain reality based upon new concepts with new structural relations, and are able to account for domain-specific phenomena in abstract terms. Advances toward understanding that resemble the explanations of experts in a given knowledge domain may develop gradually with experience and instruction. The important point is the association of a restructured kind of knowledge with age and experience, not simply the addition of more knowledge with age and experience.

The view that learning originates through participation and interaction in a social context rather than through internal psychological functions may also prove helpful for interpreting children's representations (Abel, 1948; Vygotsky, 1978). Schema theory maintains that individuals develop abstract symbolic representations of knowledge that form the personal theories of meaning used to

construe reality. As individuals encounter new information, they evaluate the fit between new input and the representations they have stored in memory. Schemata, defined as data structures for representing generic concepts stored in memory, are conceptualized as networks of interrelated variables of differing value or salience. A schema becomes instantiated when incoming data are mapped onto an existing network of variables. Inference or prediction occurs when an entire schema is generalized from a few detected variables, and the variables needed to complete the schema are inferred to be present although not detected (Rumelhart & Ortony, 1977; Rumelhart, 1981).

Consequently, specific life experiences in the social world may influence the representations of people in other countries that learners construct during social science lessons. It is plausible that individuals with restricted opportunity to experience social interaction with culturally different others may have limited or distorted schemata. Conversely, perhaps individuals whose lives include extensive experience with diversity among people have stored knowledge that enables fuller representations of people and countries.

Three studies reporting children's representations of social or cultural phenomena were identified for the empirical foundation of the present study. Lambert and Klineberg (1967) used an open interview format to ask 6- to 14-year-old children in several nations to express their views about people in other nations. They found that children who included factual information in their descriptions of foreign groups were also likely to convey a friendly attitude toward the groups. Other children who presumably had less knowledge to rely upon described foreign people in a negative manner that suggested intolerance.

Estvan and Estvan (1959) described children's perceptions or interpretations of common scenes from their own social world. Children were shown pictures depicting rural and urban communities, rich and poor settings, and common life situations, and then were asked to tell a story. The study sample, composed of first- and sixth-grade children subdivided by gender, background (rural/urban), and intelligence (high/low), revealed a qualitative difference between age levels that was consistently replicated. The older children were able to synthesize elements of the different scenes by describing structural and functional purposes of depicted activities; however, young children tended to focus on discrete elements rather than on the entire scene and to center their attention upon the thoughts and emotions of the people shown in the pictures.

Furth (1980) found qualitative changes in social thinking associated with age, and referred to these changes as developmental. The findings were based on interviews with children from 5 to 11 who were asked to describe the social world of their own experience. The descriptions were characterized by imaginative elaborations about

people and by the absence of any structural or functional analyses of social life, while a few of the older children explained some societal mechanisms.

Methodology

Based on my interest in building upon the description of what children know or believe about various countries and peoples and guided by the related principles of cognitive psychology mentioned above, I formed the following research questions. While the questions constituted a general guide for analysis and interpretation, they also permitted the discovery of meanings grounded in the representations that were not anticipated during the planning of the study.

- How can children's representations of countries and people be described?
- What cultural information is included in their representations?
- What qualities of representation are associated with age?
- What qualities of representation are associated with variety in children's own linguistic/cultural experience?

Procedures included: identification of study participants; a pilot study to refine methodology and to assess the quality of data generated by participants; selection of materials used to prompt participants to explain their representations; refinement of an interview protocol; and analysis of transcribed interviews. The data analysis process included identification and aggregation of idea units and comparison of aggregate representations across participant subgroups.

Identification of Participants

An elementary school and a middle school with multiethnic student enrollment in a community of approximately 250,000 in the central valley of California were identified for the study. The elementary school enrollment of 1,188 was 50 percent Asian, 33 percent Hispanic, 11 percent white, and 6 percent African American. Ninety-four percent of the elementary school students participated in the school's free or reduced lunch program, and 96 percent were from homes that received aid for dependent children. The middle school enrollment of 1,150 was 50 percent Hispanic, 38 percent Asian, 8 percent white, 3 percent African American, and 1 percent Native American. Eighty-nine percent participated in the free or reduced lunch program, and 72 percent were from homes that received aid for dependent children.

Table 1
Description of the Sample

Code	Gender	Age yrs/m	Country of birth	Years lived outside U.S.	Years attended U.S. schools	Preschool language(s)	Home language(s)
1	F	11/3	U.S.	None	5	English	English
2	F	10/5	U.S.	None	5	English	English
3	M	10/4	U.S.	None	5	Hmong	Hmong
4	F	11/0	Laos	7	4	Hmong	English and Hmong
5	F	10/5	U.S.	None	5	Spanish and English	Spanish and English
6	F	11/4	Thailand	5	5	Cambodian	Cambodian
7	M	10/3	U.S.	None	5	English	English
8	F	10/0	Thailand	1	5	Cambodian	Cambodian and English
9	M	9/9	U.S.	None	5	English	English
10	F	9/11	U.S.	None	5	Hmong	Hmong and English
11	M	10/11	Thailand	5	4	Hmong	Hmong and English
12	F	10/1	U.S.	None	5	Hmong and English	English
13	M	13/1	U.S.	None	8	English and Spanish	English and Spanish
14	F	13/7	Mexico	1	8	English and Spanish	English and Spanish
15	M	13/11	U. S.	None	8	Spanish	Spanish and English
16	F	12/8	Cambodia	6	7	Cambodian	English and Cambodian
17	M	14/4	U.S.	None	8	Spanish	English and Spanish
18	M	14/0	Cambodia	6	8	Cambodian	Cambodian and English
19	M	13/2	Laos	8	4	Lao	Chinese, Lao, and English
20	F	13/2	Cambodia	5	8	Cambodian	English
21	M	14/3	U.S.	None	7	English	English
22	M	13/10	U.S.	None	8	English	English
23	M	12/10	U.S.	None	8	English	English
24	M	13/8	Mexico	10	3	Spanish	Spanish

The nature of the study was explained to the school principals, and each recommended a teacher with a likely interest. Then school sites were visited to discuss purposes and procedures with a fourth-grade teacher and a seventh-grade teacher. A few students who the teachers identified as primarily non-English speaking and unable to participate in an English-only interview were eliminated from

enrollment lists, leaving approximately 95 percent of the fourth- and seventh-grade students as potential interview participants. Twelve students were selected randomly from the fourth grade and 12 students were selected randomly from the seventh grade.

At the beginning of each interview, the participant reported birthdate, native country, place of residence and language(s) used at school and at home (see Appendix A for the questions used to elicit this information). These data were compiled in a table to provide a descriptive overview of the sample (see Table 1). For those participants whose answers were vague or indefinite in the interview setting, school records were consulted to verify the information.

Participants coded 1 through 12 in Table 1 are fourth-grade students, and 13 through 24 are seventh graders. The average age of the fourth graders as a group is 10 years and 6 months, and the seventh graders' average age is 13 years and 6 months. There were 13 males and 11 females. Fourteen were born in the United States, three each in Thailand and Cambodia, and two each in Laos and Mexico. Eight of the foreign-born students lived outside the U.S. for the first few years of their lives. Fourteen learned a language other than English as preschoolers, and continued to mix English and their native language in the home setting, while three continued to speak only their native language at home.

The demographic information was scrutinized for the purpose of summarizing commonalities among the participants. The children who lived their early years in a country other than the U.S., and perhaps started formal schooling before immigrating to the U.S., were presumed to have a more culturally diverse life experience than those with no sustained residence outside the U.S. It was also assumed that the ability to use more than one language is a dimension of life experience that is enriching both culturally and linguistically. This reasoning resulted in the formation of three subgroups based on cultural and linguistic characteristics, as indicated in Table 2.

It should be noted that the study was not driven by the testing of hypotheses from previous empirical work; instead, in view of the paucity of available data addressing this issue, the intent was to provide description and interpretation of the meanings that children use to represent cultural worlds. Consequently, the sample size was chosen to permit an in-depth analysis of their verbal accounts rather than to support generalizations of any one population group. Because of the small number of participants in each of the subdivisions of the sample, any findings distinguishing the groups may be interpreted as potentially comparable and translatable, not generalizable (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Pilot Study

Successful data collection was dependent upon the generation of verbal responses in an interview situation with 10- and 13-year olds. The initial plan was to use photographs of people from different world cultural regions and to elicit participant descriptions of the peoples' lives and of the countries. In order to determine the feasibility of these procedures with the students identified for the study and to make an assessment of the quality of data likely to be generated, a pilot study was conducted. Each cooperating teacher recommended a few students to form a group composed of diverse ethnic heritage and a range of verbal

Table 2 Cultural/Linguistic Subgroups	
Group 1	
Definition	Participants who had lived in the U.S. throughout their lives and were monolingual in English.
Code (from Table 1)	1, 2, 7, 9, 21, 22, and 23 (29% of sample).
Group 2	
Definition	Participants who had experienced no sustained residence outside the U.S. but learned Spanish or Hmong during their preschool years, and continued to use the language for communication with family members.
Code	3, 5, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 17 (29% of sample).
Group 3	
Definition	Participants who spent their early years in Mexico, Thailand, Cambodia, or Laos, learned a language other than English before starting school, and continued to use the language for communication at home.
Code	4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, and 24 (42% of sample).

facility. As a result, eight students from the seventh grade and five from the fourth grade were interviewed individually using selected photos and a planned sequence of questions.

Subsequent analysis of verbal responses and nonverbal behaviors during the interviews prompted changes in the procedures. The number of photos was reduced from seven to five because some children had difficulty sustaining their concentration for the required length of time. The two photos that generated the smallest amount of verbal response were eliminated. Misunderstood questions were reworded. Fourth-grade children in particular were confused about the implicit purpose of some

questions designed to elicit knowledge of countries; however, all of the pilot participants talked freely about the people in the photos and what those people may have been doing and thinking. Consequently, pilot questions pertaining to the people were retained, and those pertaining to country were rewritten (see Appendix B).

Materials

The photos, each of which depicted an individual or group in a different nation, were selected from a published anthropologists' collection of family life around the world (Mead & Heyman, 1965). This collection offered a rich variety of scenes from the lives of ordinary people. The major ethnic or cultural regions of the world were included, intentionally selected as those that were likely to be within the heritage of the children participating in the study. Brief descriptions of the final five photos selected after the pilot study follow:

Photo A, Thailand: a boy sitting in a road and gazing into the distance;

Photo B, Pakistan: a boy and an elderly man sitting close to one another with their attention fixed upon what appears to be a small board and writing pen;

Photo C, Peru: a man showing a portrait of a young woman to three small children who are gathered around him;

Photo D, Ghana: a man, woman, small child and a baby appearing to pose in front of a camera for a group photograph;

Photo E, the former U.S.S.R.: a table loaded with food and drink, with a man seated at the head and adults and children seated around the table.

Physical characteristics, clothing, and facial expression or demeanor of the depicted individuals provided visual cues for interpretation; however, the five photos contained few background details that could be used to infer geographic location.

Data Collection Procedures

The 24 randomly selected students were released from class for individual interviews with the researcher. Each participant was informed of the researcher's purpose and invited to express ideas freely, and each was assured that the discussions would not be graded

or incorporated into their teacher's evaluation procedures. Interviews were conducted in private, with the researcher and the participant seated at a small table. The sessions ranged from 20 to 40 minutes; they were recorded on audio tape, and were later transcribed verbatim.

The same procedure was followed for all interviews. First, each participant was asked the questions designed for the purpose of collecting demographic data about the sample. Then the five photographs were shown to each participant one at a time and in the same sequence in each interview. The questions to elicit representations of country and people were repeated in the same order upon presentation of each photo. The researcher turned each photo face down at the point when participants were asked to explain their knowledge of the country that they suggested as the hypothetical home of the people shown in the photo. This was done to discourage reliance on visual cues in the photos instead of stored knowledge or meanings. Throughout the interviews, probing questions were used to encourage participants to expand and clarify their representations.

Data Analysis Procedures

The interview transcripts were read several times for the purpose of organizing the data into content categories in an inductive manner. It was immediately clear that the participant meanings could be divided into those meant to describe the people depicted in the photos and those that provided information about their hypothesized native countries. Consequently, the first step in data organization consisted of the preparation of two lists of idea units for each photo and each participant (i.e., representation of people in the photos and representation of the country). Idea units were determined by separating groups of words of distinct and singular meaning from other meanings expressed by the participant; for example, "Some people don't really live very good in Mexico" and "They have to beg for food and money" were considered distinct units. The exact words of participants were preserved. This phase resulted in the organization of the verbatim interview transcripts into two lists of idea units per photo for each participant.

The listed idea units for representation of people were further divided into categories that emerged from repeated reading of the lists. The lists were coded independently by the researcher and a graduate assistant, and all codings were compared and discussed until complete agreement was reached on the definition of category content and the classification of every idea unit on the lists. This process yielded the following category definitions: (a) description of physical appearance or demeanor as detected from clues in the photo (e.g., "He has brown hair"); (b) inference about consciousness; i.e., thoughts, emotions, motives, and the reason, if cited (e.g., "He feels sad because

he has no friends"); (c) inference about the activity shown in the photo and the reason, if cited (e.g., "I think they are celebrating a birthday or holiday"); and (d) inference about conditions, events, or activities in the life of the people that cannot be perceived directly in the details of the photo (e.g., "I think his wife's sort of like a woman who washes clothes for other people").

Next, the idea units were transformed from linear lists into aggregate representations written in paragraph form. Units that were the same in meaning were not duplicated, but were collapsed instead into one unit that was placed at or near the beginning of the paragraphs; i.e., if several participants said that the person in the photo looked sad, this idea unit was used to open the paragraph of aggregated data. Since idea units from every participant were included, the aggregate representations were not necessarily internally consistent in logic and meaning; specifically, the idea that the person looked happy, even if expressed by only one participant, was also included.

Aggregates for age level and linguistic/cultural subgroups were formed by deleting the inapplicable units from the paragraphs that included data from all 24 participants. This procedure yielded six aggregate representations from each of the four categories of idea units about people in the five photos. The resulting 120 aggregate representations in narrative form permitted comparison of meanings across subgroups for the purpose of addressing the third and fourth research questions.

All of the countries or regions that participants hypothesized to be the homes of persons shown in the five photos were identified and idea units were listed for each. If a country was associated with more than one photo, all the idea units for the country were combined into one list. To make an appreciable number of units in each list, some countries were grouped together and identified as cultural regions. This resulted in separate lists for Mexico, Africa, and East Asia (including Asia, China, Japan, Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia); India, the Middle East, and North Africa (including Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Arabia, and Saudi Arabia); North America (including America, the United States, the North Pole, Michigan, California, New York, and the city where the study took place); and Europe (including Russia and England). Aggregate representations for country or region were then prepared in the same manner as the aggregates for representations of people. Separate paragraphs for age and linguistic/cultural subgroups were not prepared for North America, India, the Middle East, North Africa, and Europe. Because there were only one or two participants in some of these subgroups, aggregation of data was not considered appropriate. Consequently, data processing yielded aggregate representations in age and linguistic/cultural subgroups for Mexico, Africa, and East Asia.

To address the first two research questions, the three country representations were scrutinized as well as aggregate representations that included all participants in each of the four categories of human representations. The paragraphs were compared for all five photos, and common themes emerged based on similarity of expressed meanings. Comparison of the aggregated representations in age and linguistic/cultural subgroups germane to the third and fourth research questions was then undertaken. The operational definition of qualities of representation that emerged through repeated comparisons included noted differences and similarities in substantive information and prevalent interpretations and the extent of detail or elaboration provided by participants within groups.

Results

Representations of Persons

In the subcategories of data concerning appearance, thoughts, activities, and life conditions of people depicted in the photos, four dominant themes emerged from the comparison of the aggregated representations for all 24 participants. Apparently, the participants were particularly concerned with advantages and disadvantages in life circumstances. The first theme concerned the hardships of living. Participants gave primarily negative appraisals of the everyday lives of the people depicted. People were more often described as sad and poor than happy and enjoying life. The following are excerpts from the aggregated representations of all 24 participants:

The boy lives in a poor home, doesn't eat as well as other children, and doesn't have shoes or money to buy lots of clothes. He was born kind of blind. He's tired of work (Photo A).

The boy looks sick, dark around the eyes. They're not dirty like they lived on the streets (Photo B).

They look like they're poor. The house is broken, messy, not clean, old, and the clothes are dirty. They don't have too much money or very good things, or food, or clothes. They live in a very old home, a shack; they work in the field (Photo C).

Participants commented frequently about relationships between persons, often family members. They pointed out that people are fortunate to have a home and family because they become sad and lonely without family. A sense of loss or of being disconnected from

others thus formed a second recurring theme in their inferences. A number of comments alluded to the death of family members and separation from home or country, or predicted future losses. Several children thought the people in the photos wanted to live elsewhere:

The boy feels sad because he's lonely. He doesn't have a home. He is embarrassed to be on the streets. His parents died. He feels happy because he has a big sister and brother. He's thinking about where to live when he grows up because he doesn't like his country, and maybe the Cambodian war might come, so he might die (Photo A).

The man is thinking about what the baby is going to grow up to be like, or if the baby will die before having a chance to live his life. They would like to come and see how it is over here (Photo D).

The man is happy that he has a home and a loving family. He's thinking about having a good time, being with family and friends. He's proud that his relatives came for dinner, lucky to have a daughter, granddaughter, and friends (Photo E).

The value of learning was a main theme in participant inferences about the activities shown in the photos. Some commented that success in learning makes people happy because of utilitarian purposes. In two photos, the elder person in the photo was presumed to be a father or grandfather who was teaching his children or grandchildren, and who was concerned that they learn well:

The man is holding the boy's (his son's or grandson's) hand, showing him the letters, dipping the pen for him, making sure he's doing it right, teaching him how to hold a pen or feather right. The man feels happy about teaching his son to write. The boy wants to learn, to draw, to grow up knowing how to write, to get a job or to be successful (Photo B).

Following are two excerpts to demonstrate the circumstances of life imagined by the study participants. In reference to the family of four, ostensibly posing for a photograph, comments ranged from "They need help because they're dying" to a description of a good life built upon hard work. The poor and hardworking people depicted in the photo of a family dinner were described as fortunate because they have a home and family. Again, a sense of tragedy emerges:

They live on the husband's salary or what he catches for meals. They might take a trip to somewhere when they have enough money. They live good, work hard to make money, live well, survive in Africa (Photo D).

The baby's parents died. The baby is lucky because in the Cambodian war when the Soviet man came into his house, he was hiding in the big basket that his mother or grandmother made, and he didn't die (Photo D).

The man has a family, a wife, a lot of kids; they're healthy; cousins that live in different places, friends. He owns the house. He's lucky because some people don't have meals, lots of clothes, and a home to live in (Photo E).

A few generalizations about cultural practices or beliefs were described in a factual manner as if their veracity were accepted without doubt; however, since few such claims were voiced, they are perhaps better considered as outliers rather than as indicators of salient patterns of reasoning:

Black people never have a doctor. When they have babies, they take care of themselves. When they have a baby or at celebrations like birthdays they dance with music, get excited, and jump up and down. Sometimes they cry when the baby is not right (Photo D).

Representations of Countries

As previously explained, the children were asked to decide where the people in each photo lived and to tell about their country. To some extent, participants apparently selected world regions on the basis of the ethnicity of those depicted in the photos; for example, most of the countries suggested for the boy from Thailand were in East or Southeast Asia. Mexico was the most frequently suggested home for the Peruvian family. The Ghanaian family was placed in Africa, but no countries of the African continent were named. The photos depicting residents of Pakistan and the former U.S.S.R. seemed to be the most difficult to place. Some hypothesized countries were actually U.S. states or cities (see Table 3).

Several times, participants pointed out that a country or region was different in one or several aspects, and the norm for comparison when stated was *us*; for example, participants reported that the people do not look like us, or speak our language, or live in our kind of houses.

Table 3
Hypothesized Home Countries of People in Photos

Photo A: Thailand			
Asia	3	Asia or China	1
Japan	3	China	1
Laos	3	Cambodia	1
Thailand	3	India	1
Mexico	3	Egypt	1
China or Japan	2	Fresno	1
A strange place	1		
Photo B: Pakistan			
Africa	6	Japan	1
India	5	China or Japan	1
Iraq	2	Egypt	1
Iraq or Iran	1	Arabia	1
Asia	1	Saudi Arabia	1
China	1	England	1
Photo C: Peru			
Mexico	9	Australia	1
Chile	1	North or South Pole	1
Asia or China	1	Michigan	1
China	1	California	1
China or Japan	1	a far land	1
Thailand	1	Hmong	1
Cambodia	1	Eskimos	1
England	1		
Photo D: Ghana			
Africa	22	A strange place	1
Photo E: former U.S.S.R.			
Mexico	9	United States	1
America	4	Michigan	1
Europe	1	California	1
Europe or Russia	1	New York	1
Australia	1	Cowboys	1

In the aggregate representations that follow, it was not usually indicated, however, that either *ours* or *theirs* was necessarily better, just different:

In Mexico, they have different money with different presidents on it. They don't speak English, they only speak Spanish.

Africans are black people, they look different; it's like a black continent. They speak and write different languages than us. They can speak English real good.

They go to different kinds of schools and learn different things than we do. In Japan, all the schoolchildren wear the same clothes. They pay attention to the flag, but it's a different flag.

Prominent themes in the aggregated representations for Mexico, East Asia, and Africa pertained to commerce, standard of living, routine daily activities, housing conditions, or other concepts of a general economic nature. Details were elaborated in accounts of making bricks for house building in Mexico and trapping and killing animals in Africa. Contrasts between rich and poor lifestyles and traditional and modern economies, and the perception that many people are poor and lead difficult lives persisted in the country representations, just as previously noted in the representations of people. Once again, the image of people forced to live on the streets was present in the children's representations; however, participants acknowledged that economic disparities exist, especially in reference to the material advantages found in America:

In Mexico, some live in cottages or shacks made out of tin. Some live in the trees. Indians live there under the trees and in shacks. They live outside on the streets, in stairways, wherever they can find places to live. Houses are real small; they don't have enough room. The rent is very high and a lot of people don't get paid that much. Houses aren't that good, but some (rich places) are on the other side of town. They make their houses. They make their own stove to make bread and bricks to build their houses. They put tires in the stove, it gets hot and red. They stack up the bricks and use a diesel to take them to build their house. Some people walk around begging for money on the streets. They sell things to eat—chickens, baseballs, and chairs. They clean, wash, and rub against a rock with water and soap. Some people build roads; some take animals to the fields to feed them; some are policemen. They farm, grow their food, own pigs, cows, horses.

In Africa, they hunt and kill animals for food. People live in danger from elephants, tigers, or lions rushing through. To trap animals, one guy goes up in a tree with a blow gun. The rest of the people are hiding; they make a noise and throw sticks with sharp stones at the end of them at the animals when they are rushing; all the animals run; they kill them, cut off their skin. Some people in Africa are healthy, well fed, kind of rich. Other people are poor and little, have no money, can't find anything to eat, and need water. They have a few stores in Africa. They use clams and shells for money, and leaves to put things in. There's coal, gold, and diamonds there. Men get strong from working in the fields, and they are builders. There's starvation in some countries.

In East Asia, people are very poor. It's hard to live over there. Some people don't have food, a house, good clothes, or shoes. They work a lot, feeding cows, farming, gardening, and growing rice.

In America, they do different things than in other countries. Lots of people have cars. They have roads, cars, animals, motorcycles, and high-heeled shoes. There's a lot of good food to eat, dinner, cups, and glasses. They have houses, stores with everything, school, good clothes, cousins, and aunts. There's a lot of good places. People have a job.

Another theme centered upon sociopolitical events and issues typically presented in the news media. Perhaps these comments suggest that the children in this study have an awareness of conflict and injustices in countries other than the United States; however, their explanations presented fragmented and simplistic conceptualizations of war, racism, and international relations:

They have a racist problem; a lot of white people don't like the blacks in Africa. A black leader, Nelson Mandela, stood up and was put in jail for a long time. They took him out, and now he's an African leader.

There was a war in Saigon; people got worried 'cause people can kill each other. The Vietnam(ese) came and shot them (Cambodians), and told them to do hard work.

We were at war with Iraq. I heard that they're at war, that they wanted peace. People came from Iraq to our country to start a new life. Don't they treat them like slaves or something?

Some come here for a year or we go there, exchange students. They're friendly when you get to know them. One of their chemical places blew up, a radiation place, and a lot of people died. They got a mean president sometimes. The U.S. is becoming friends with Russia.

Qualities Associated with Age

To address the third research question, separate age-group representations were compared for each of the four subcategories pertaining to people in the photos and for three of the seven country representations (Mexico, Africa, and East Asia). One contrast that came into immediate focus was a difference in the length of paragraphs. The fourth grader representations of people contained more idea units than the seventh grader representations. Fourth graders elaborated more about the lives and thoughts of the people depicted, and mentioned more details visible in the photos. In contrast, for two of the three countries or regions, seventh grader representations were longer; thus, the tendency was for the younger children to devote more attention to the description of people, and for the older children to talk more about country.

The fourth-grader representations of people were generally longer because more words were used to describe the salient themes, not because they included more or different themes; for example, fourth graders gave the following details about the boy from Thailand: "He's a little sickly because he doesn't eat as well as other children. He doesn't have shoes and money to buy lots of clothes. He's poor." The seventh grader descriptions offer similar content but far fewer words: "He's hungry and poor."

Distinctly similar content emerged from the analysis of the two age-group representations about people; for example, both age groups used facial expressions in the photos to infer thoughts and emotions, and inferred remarkably similar purposes for the actions depicted in the photos. Both fourth- and seventh-grade children explained that family, friends, and adequate provision of the basic necessities in life were sources of happiness, while the loss of family members was a source of unhappiness. The value of learning was cited consistently.

Some distinctions between the age groups were noted for individual photos, but did not generalize across all five photos. In reference to the photo of a man and three small children looking at a

portrait of a woman, fourth graders made inferences about wishes or fantasies of the children:

The girl wants to be like the lady in the picture, be pretty, and have good clothes. The boy wishes that he would be a missionary to go all over the place and teach about death. The queen or prince in the picture is rich and gives them money (Photo C).

The fourth-grader tendency to be imaginative may be contrasted with the seventh graders' practical, responsible accounts of coping with life's circumstances; however, as this contrast was noted infrequently, it did not dominate the overall tone:

After the boy knows how to write, he'll go to school; probably write books, be an author when he grows up (Photo B).

Recall that in the aggregated representations of Mexico, Africa and East Asia, it was emphasized that people looked different and had different customs. Most of these comments were made by fourth graders:

They speak and write different languages than us, Japanese or something. In Japan, they write weird. It's hard to speak their language; the words are better. Maybe they celebrate a few holidays that we don't even celebrate.

Seventh-grader representations of Africa and East Asia contained an appreciable amount of information about the locations as geographic, political, or historical entities, while fourth graders offered little information of this nature. Credibility of information varied in both age groups. Some statements reflected factual knowledge of the regions and others reflected misconceptions:

Lots of kangaroos in Africa (fourth grade).

In East Asia, there's a lot of people. They don't have guns (fourth grade).

Africa is like a black continent. There's coal, gold, diamonds there. There's starvation in some countries. They have a racist problem (seventh grade).

Asia's the largest continent in the world, also called the Soviet Union. Nowadays it's packed, people from the outside are coming into the middle. I think they have just one child (seventh grade).

They built the Great Wall in China to protect themselves. Intruders have to pay to go through. There's a governor or emperor in China (seventh grade).

Qualities Associated with Linguistic/Cultural Variation

For the fourth research question, comparison of the aggregated representations of the linguistic/cultural subgroups indicated that content themes pertaining to people were remarkably similar across the three groups. Each group inferred that some people depicted were sad and lonely, without friends or parents, or possibly thinking about going to another country. Uniformly, the participants thought that older people wanted the young to learn, and that people were happy when they were with their family.

The few substantive differences detected across the three linguistic/cultural subgroups were found in the information provided to elaborate or support the dominant themes, such as the reasons given to explain what people in the photos were doing. These differences did not distinguish the total interpretation of any one group from the other two groups, and the small size of the groups posed a limitation on interpretation of group differences; however, they presented the only qualities of representation that varied with the linguistic/cultural background of the participants.

Bilingual immigrant children (Group 3) made more comments seemingly related to the fact that the people depicted were situated in different cultures; for example, statements that described a man teaching his son how to write his way and about his history implied that the man's language and history were not the same as the language and history of the participant interpreting the photo. The suggestion that a family "should have another party in another country so no one could fight over the war" inferred that war was or had been a part of the experience of the family. Inferences about the Ghanaian family presented interesting clues about the children who spent their early years of life in Mexico, Thailand, Cambodia, or Laos. They inferred that all the family's thoughts were focused upon uncertainties, anxieties, and concerns about the future. Although adults in the photo are smiling and Group 1 and 2 participants described the family as happy and grateful to be together, there was no suggestion of such happiness in this group's representation:

The woman is thinking how her baby is going to grow up; if it will be sick. She's thinking what's going to happen to them. She doesn't want to stay there because they don't have good clothes. They need help cause they're dying (Photo D).

Comparison of the aggregated representations for Mexico, Africa, and East Asia across the groups differentiated by linguistic/cultural background yielded the familiar descriptions of living conditions and routine activities of ordinary people. Generally, people of all three regions were described as poor, inadequately housed, and working primarily in agricultural pursuits. Group 2 descriptions of Mexico and Africa were longer than Group 1 and 3 representations. Even though its members had not experienced any sustained residence outside the U.S., Group 2 included more descriptive details, suggesting that learning occurred through vicarious sources (Africa) and from direct experience in the setting (Mexico). Some participants in Group 2 may have visited Mexico:

When you go out in the country, you see how the people live in cars—poorly, dirty. They're friendly. If you're doing stuff by yourself, they just come over to help you (Mexico).

They have no good clothes to wear. African people dress in blankets they put around them. They're barefooted. Some are naked (Africa).

No political, economic, historical, social facts or generalizations were included in the representations of Mexico. All three linguistic/cultural groups commented about Mexican people but not about Mexico as a nation. The same finding applies to the Group 3 bilingual immigrant children's representations for Africa and East Asia. Group 3 children, who lived in other countries early in their lives, did not offer abstract knowledge of the countries that they hypothesized to be the homes of persons depicted in the five photos; instead, they described their ideas of the daily life experienced by people living in these countries.

Summary of Qualities of Representation

Overall, participants chose to describe the hardships of life and to emphasize a human need for security and basic necessities. People of the five countries were generally perceived as poor, sad, and hard working. Those with a home and family were fortunate as opposed to those who had experienced loss, especially children whose parents had died. Both adults and children reportedly valued learning because

learning contributes to the building of a good life. In general, participants named home countries or regions that were plausible matches with the ethnicity of persons depicted (especially Africa). Their representations of people as having difficulties, working hard, and primarily experiencing a rather austere lifestyle were continued in the representations of the hypothesized home countries of the people; for example, housing conditions were seen as poor in Mexico, and people in Africa presumably work hard just to survive.

The 10-year-old children in the study supplied elaborate details about people, their thoughts and feelings, and the events perceived to typify their lives. In contrast, they included negligible amounts of factual information about countries. Thirteen-year-olds demonstrated some knowledge of physical geography, political events, and societal issues in their representations of a country or region; however, some statements about countries conveyed misconceptions or incorrect information. Abstractions at the country level were relatively unelaborated in terms of richness of detail in comparison to the representations of people. On the other hand, a few accounts of customs associated with life in different regions, such as building houses or trapping animals, were developed in considerable detail. Ten-year-olds frequently pointed out that other people in other countries were different in various ways, but 13-year-olds did not include this terminology in their representations.

Content themes did not differ substantially across the three groups differentiated by linguistic/cultural variation; however, minor differences distinguished the representations of the children who were born outside the United States and were not native English speakers from those of the others. The children in this group focused only upon the lives of people and did not provide information abstracted to the country level. They also persistently characterized life as filled with hardship, and said that people have anxieties about their future. The other groups acknowledged that people in other countries could build a good life with hard work.

Conclusion

The remarkable consistency among the representations of quality of life in five different cultural regions of the world suggests that strong images dominate the schemata of the children who were interviewed. Perhaps it would be informative to recall that the children were selected from two schools with enrollments typified by low socioeconomic status in U.S. society. It may be plausible to assume that there is a relation between the quality of life that these children experience in reality and the quality of life that they hypothesized for people in other countries.

Application of the theory of schema instantiation may help explain the persistence of salient themes. The recurring comments about life's hardships, the frequently reported sense of family loss, references to the value of learning, and detailed descriptions of housing conditions may present primary schemata variables; for example, people were perceived as having no money for food and good clothes and as living in shacks or on the streets. Also, people were described as sad because someone they loved had died or because they were separated from family. These conditions, not apparent from visual cues, were inferred because the people depicted were judged to be poor or sad; that is, a network of related variables formed the participant schemata for poverty and sadness. Entire schemata were instantiated when the available images provided data to map onto some of the variables of the poverty and sadness networks; thus, complete schemata were generalized from the perceived data, including details that could not be verified solely from inspection of the photos.

In planning the study, it was speculated that the younger children's representations might be less full or rich than the older children's; however, it was content rather than richness that differentiated the representations of the two age groups. The 13-year-olds acted more like social scientists talking about some phenomena at a societal level (e.g., war) and they showed an awareness of issues of principle (e.g., racism), while the 10-year-olds attended to life as experienced on a personal level. Ten-year-olds used more descriptive language in their accounts of daily life and living conditions. Selected accounts were imaginative and elaborated with descriptive detail (e.g., customs surrounding the birth of babies in the black culture).

The theoretical idea of knowledge restructuring provides context for consideration of the age differences discovered in the study. Thirteen-year olds did not include more information than 10-year-olds, but instead presented a substantive variation in the kind of information included in their representations. The older children's representations suggested that they had some knowledge and understanding developed through study of the social sciences or at least an awareness of world events. If the younger children had similar knowledge structures, they did not choose to include them in their representations. One may infer that an association between age and new knowledge structures was indicated in the results of the study.

No prominent differences associated with diversity in children's own linguistic and cultural background were discovered in the study. The comparison across three groups distinguished by linguistic/cultural variation showed similarity in qualities of representation. Generally, representations did not become richer or more tolerant of differences as the diversity in children's own life experience increased. One exception

was noted among children born outside the United States, who reported a slightly more pessimistic view of the circumstances of living.

In the researcher's judgment, the representations produced by the children in this study did not support a tendency to negatively evaluate people of other countries. Even though the younger children pointed out differences in ethnicity and custom, they did not use pejorative characterizations that suggest intolerance. Perhaps a neutral attitude toward ethnic or cultural differences rather than a tendency to rank or make insidious comparisons is the most fitting interpretation of their descriptions.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study was not based upon an existing research base since the documentation of children's schemata for diverse people and countries is not developed in social science education. Consequently, it presents an introduction to the meanings that students bring to their study of cultural variation and social phenomena. Extended lines of research are needed to provide information about the schema that children are likely to call upon as they generate meaning during the process of learning about various countries or cultures. The ethnic and linguistic variation and low socioeconomic status of the participant group in the study typifies public school enrollment in many localities of the nation. It seems that the schema of children whose life histories include disruption and immigration, personal tragedy, and economic hardship are virtually unknown to the education research community.

To extend the line of research, in-depth case studies and longitudinal profiles of individual children are needed. Creative ways to question children that prompt them to fully explain what they are thinking are crucial for building a quality data bank. Observations of instructional episodes and analyses of verbal classroom interactions would provide valuable information about schema activation during instruction. In sum, the entire genre of research is open for exploration and explanation.

Appendix A

Questions used to derive demographic information

- How old are you?
- What is your birthdate?
- Were you born in the United States? If not, what is the name of the country where you were born?
- Have you lived in the United States for all your life? If not, what other countries have you lived in and for how many years?

- Have you gone to school in any countries other than the United States? If yes, what countries and for how many years?
- What language(s) did you learn to speak before you were old enough to go to school?
- What languages have you learned in the schools that you have attended?
- What language(s) do you use at home when you are talking with your parents or other older people and when talking with sisters and brothers or other kids in the family?

Appendix B

Standardized questions about photographs

- Suppose we said to the person (or people) in this picture, "Tell us all about yourself." What would he/she (they) say?
- What is the person (or people) in this picture thinking?
- How does the person (or people) feel?
- What were the people doing when this photograph was taken?
- Decide where the people in this photo live and tell everything you know about their country.
- What do you know about people who live in their country that you did not see in the picture?

References

- Abel, T. (1948). The operation called 'Verstehen'. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 54, 211-218.
- Alleman, J. E. & Rosaen, C. L. (1991). The cognitive, social-emotional, and moral development characteristics of students: Basis for elementary and middle school social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 121-133). New York: Macmillan.
- Armento, B. J. (1986). Research on teaching social studies. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 942-951). New York: Macmillan.
- Carey, S. (1985). *Conceptual change in childhood*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Cushner, K. (1988). Achieving intercultural effectiveness: Current knowledge, goals, and practices. *Education and Urban Society*, 20(2), 159-176.
- Estvan, F. J. & Estvan, E. W. (1959). *The child's world: His social perception*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Furth, H. G. (1980). *The world of grown-ups: Children's conceptions of society*. New York: Elsevier.

- Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Kobus, D. K. (1983). The developing field of global education: A review of the literature. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8(1), 21-28.
- Lambert, W. E., & Klineberg, O. (1967). *Children's views of foreign peoples: A cross-national study*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Levstik, L. S., & Pappas, C. C. (1992). New directions for studying historical understanding. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 20(4), 369-385.
- Mead, M., & Heyman, K. (1965). *Family*. New York: Macmillan.
- Reimer, J., Paolitto, D. P., & Hersh, R. H. (1983). *Promoting moral growth: From Piaget to Kohlberg*. New York: Longman.
- Rosenzweig, L. W. (Ed.). (1982). *Developmental perspectives on the social studies* (Bulletin No. 66). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Rumelhart, D. E., & Ortony, A. (1977). The representation of knowledge in memory. In R. C. Anderson & R. J. Spiro (Eds.), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge* (pp. 99-135). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1981). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 3-26). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Torney-Purta, J. (1991). Schema theory and cognitive psychology: Implications for social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 19(2), 189-210.
- Vosniadou, S., Brewer, W. F. (1987). Theories of knowledge restructuring in development. *Review of Educational Research*, 57(1), 51-67.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

SANDRA J. LeSOURD is Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Educational Technology, California State University—Fresno, Fresno, CA 93740-0002.

LEARNING INCLUSION/INCLUSION IN LEARNING: CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FOR A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY

Kathy Bickmore
Cleveland State University

Abstract

Society is conflictual: pluralistic democracy in particular relies on conflict as a mechanism of change. To be incorporated as citizens, young people need skills and information for making decisions and solving problems; that is, for handling the conflicts that come up in society. This research analyzes two cases of implemented world studies curricula: the teachers followed the same district guidelines, but they made contrasting choices regarding how to involve their diverse students in social education. In the class taught by Ruth Murray,¹ students "learned inclusion" by analyzing teacher-interpreted information about diverse cultures and ideologies. Sarah Gilbert's students were "included in learning" by taking conflicting viewpoints in response to social studies themes. Attention to conflict seemed to foster inclusion of some of the silent students found in both classes.

Most governments have been based, practically, on the denial of equal rights....Ours began by affirming those rights. They said, some [people] are too ignorant, and vicious, to share in government. Possibly so, said we; and by your system, you would always keep them ignorant, and vicious. We proposed to give all a chance; and we expected the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant wiser, and all better, happier together. We made the experiments, and the fruit is before us.

—Abraham Lincoln, 1854 (emphasis in original)

¹All proper names in the case studies are pseudonyms.

Introduction

One hundred and forty years ago, Abraham Lincoln asserted that giving “all” the chance to develop into strong and informed citizens was essential to our nation’s democratic experiment. During and since Lincoln’s time, there has been continual struggle to broaden the theory and practice of who may be meant by “all”. There have always been groups of citizens—poor, female, nonwhite, or recently immigrated, for example—whose right to share in government is not fully honored or realized. In this article, I am concerned with democratic inclusion, with the operational extension of citizenship to the diverse generation of young people now in high school. How can social studies, the school subject most directly responsible for citizenship education, prepare the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant to grow wiser, and all of us to become better, happier together?

Citizenship is membership, especially in a nation-state community. In practice, membership carries the potential for both inclusion and exclusion. On the one hand, education for the new members of our national community can be oriented toward norms for good behavior, including support for the current regime. As in many clubs, this orientation tends toward exclusion because it teaches consensus rather than affirms dissent, and it implies that members must earn (by conforming) the privilege of belonging. Alternatively, citizenship education can be oriented toward preparation and development of skills. This view tends toward inclusion because it affirms the importance of new members, new voices, dissent, and change. If a democracy is to broaden its base and deepen its structure for participation, then citizenship education rests upon inclusion, mutual challenge, and participation in preparing for the future.

The society for which we are preparing our students is full of conflict—because it is pluralistic, because it is democratic (protective of dissent), and because it is changing rapidly. Teachers create miniature social systems in their classrooms, where politically relevant behavior (e.g., attitudes toward authority or ways of handling conflict) is modeled and practiced. Practice of new behaviors is important for solidifying both learning gains and attitude change. Bandura demonstrates that one may learn generalized ideas or attitudes as well as specific behaviors by observing and copying respected models (1986). When involvement in and practice with resolving genuine conflict is encouraged, students have an opportunity to gain confidence and skill in communication, problem solving, and negotiation (e.g., Johnson & Johnson, 1979). This suggests that classroom practice in such tasks as problem solving, identifying and taking alternative perspectives, and analyzing divergent sources of information can result in behavior, skills, and attitudes that can be applied to conflicts in other contexts at later times.

information can result in behavior, skills, and attitudes that can be applied to conflicts in other contexts at later times.

This research draws two cases from a study of four public high school teachers handling and modeling the problem of citizenship inclusion in their social studies classrooms. In interpreting and implementing social studies curricula, teachers represent to their students particular images of citizenship, of leadership, and of the political system in which these are embedded. In hidden as well as overt social studies curricula, students are shown what kinds of people may be social or political actors, and what kinds of behaviors are expected of citizens. In *subject matter* (implemented curricular content), national and international heroes, villains, and other recurring themes serve as models of citizenship expectations. Curricula may attempt to foster love of country by emphasizing similarity and unanimity, by minimizing conflict, or alternatively by emphasizing the wide scope of valued members in the national community, using conflict as a learning opportunity. To present alternative viewpoints is to represent additional people and groups as significant parts of the national community. In *pedagogy* (implemented curricular process), the classroom is a laboratory for the practice of citizenship behaviors. If a wide spectrum of student voices are heard in relation to curricular topics, then a wide spectrum of students are both practicing skills for and observing models of inclusion in a pluralistic democracy.

Conflict in Teaching and Learning

Conflict is "sharp disagreement or opposition, as of interest or ideas" (*Webster's New World Dictionary*, 1988, p. 292). No other concept captures so well the difficulty (and the beauty) of democracy in a pluralistic and rapidly changing society: democratic life involves conflict. Conflict may arise from misperception or miscommunication, but it arises just as often from real divergence of interests, values, or needs (Deutsch, 1973). The central concern of conflict is the existence or acknowledgment of divergent needs or contradictory views, not the means for confronting that divergence: conflict may be addressed in any number of nonviolent or violent ways. Dissent is one kind of conflict that is particularly relevant to social studies because it implies public statement or action beyond private disagreement. In social studies curricula, both subject-matter content and pedagogical strategies can be designed to emphasize or to minimize conflict.

Conflictual subject matter in the curriculum presents inclusive images of who makes history. Teachers may pose problems by introducing controversial material or by including contrasting viewpoints from different cultures, ideologies, or sources of information. Differences do not always come into conflict (individuals may have

happened and why, or three parties to a situation disagree on how that situation should be changed).

Pedagogical strategies in the curriculum involve the face-to-face confrontation of conflicts. Such conflicts may occur spontaneously due to differences in background, opinion, or needs among students and teachers, or they may be planned aspects of the teacher's agenda. Conflict resolution behavior including bias awareness and negotiation skills may be encouraged, tolerated, or discouraged. One of the ways schools reproduce social inequality is by encouraging some students to practice confronting meaningful problems, while at the same time discouraging others from handling critical or conflictual material; for example, 'smart', cooperative, or self-confident students who are given challenging material and whose voices are heard in many classrooms are disproportionately male and/or white and/or affluent (e.g., Anyon, 1981; Metz, 1978; Spender & Sarah, 1988).

It is possible for a teacher to use conflictual subject matter to teach contrasting views about social phenomena without significantly opening the classroom process to conflictual behavior (airing heartfelt clashes among personal opinions). Likewise, it is possible to encourage diversity and dissent in the classroom without significantly changing the subject matter. Pedagogy and subject-matter conflict interact. They are separable in theory and to some extent in particular teachers' inclinations and skills but in the realm of implemented curricular practice, the two dimensions are intertwined.

The most direct effect of using conflict in teaching is the modeling of diverse viewpoints and the opportunity to develop conflict management skills through practice. This is why conflict in the process of teaching is as important as conflict in the presented content. A vast amount of social learning takes place through observation and processing of modeled behavior (Bandura, 1986; Dawson, Prewitt, & Dawson, 1977). Teachers are often valued credible models in comparison to other adults in a child's life (Ehman, 1980; Harwood, 1991). To be sure, students are exposed to similar issues in the community, media, and so forth, but in the classroom, these conflicts may be confronted in the relatively safe, integrated, and systematic ways likely to facilitate development (Eyler, 1980); thus schools, and social studies classes in particular because of their responsibility for democratic socialization, are important sources of political learning. Student learners selectively focus on, remember, understand or adapt, and act out the behaviors they witness in the classroom.

The work of Piaget and others has shown that young people are not passive receptacles for knowledge, but rather are actively involved in the construction of meaning out of their experiences (1955, also e.g., Resnick, 1987). Two people can be affected differently by the same experience. In Piaget's terms, some information is assimilated into a

Resnick, 1987). Two people can be affected differently by the same experience. In Piaget's terms, some information is assimilated into a person's understanding fairly easily when it fits into a preexisting schema or conceptual framework. In other cases, when an experience does not fit with a person's prior understanding, the conflict may stimulate cognitive accommodation; that is, a creation or restructuring of mental avenues for better understanding. Pedagogy involving high levels of conflict has been shown to increase the scope and complexity of students' cognitive schematas (Torney-Purta, 1989):

From the perspective of Piagetian theory, conflict is an essential component of development. It is the inability of existing cognitive structure to assimilate perturbation—be they externally or internally induced—that calls up the cognitively progressive equilibration process. Thus conflict is a critical process for...informing educational experiences that induce cognitive growth (Liben, 1987, p. 24).

The presentation of conflict therefore offers a qualitatively different learning opportunity from the presentation of consensual or simple additive information.

Festinger also suggested that conflict can stimulate thinking (1964). *Cognitive dissonance* describes a condition of internal conflict; for example, a person may discover that his/her beliefs are logically inconsistent or that s/he has behaved in a manner contrary to her/his beliefs. According to Festinger, people prefer harmony: they generally try to resolve such dissonance by reexamining or changing their knowledge and beliefs. Thus, the examination of contradictory evidence about ideas or the presentation of alternative explanations for events can stimulate thinking and sometimes learning.

For many students, serious conflict and even violence are already daily occurrences. Conflict affects different students differently. Normally, school knowledge is divorced from such real life conflicts (Fine, 1991). Some student experiences with conflict outside of school, however, could make conflictual teaching more relevant and effective than a consensual approach. On the other hand, students who have experienced traumatic conflict might feel too intimidated by ambiguity or raised voices, for example, to benefit from conflictual pedagogy. Other students who have frequent trouble with schoolwork might be confused or left behind by complex, conflictual material. Individuals who are able to speak up and be heard in this type of discussion practice important skills and rehearse citizenship roles that differ from those learned by the listeners. It is a complex and uncertain endeavor to present conflict to a broad and diverse group of students.

Enormous energy must be required to sustain beliefs in equal opportunity and the color-blind power of credentials, and to silence nagging losses of faith when evidence to the contrary compels on a daily basis....To not name bears consequences for all students, but more so for low-income, minority youths. To not name is to systematically alienate, [to] cut off from home, from heritage and from lived experience, and ultimately to sever from their educational process (Fine, 1987, pp. 160-161).

Representing society as inclusive has broad implications beyond those of self-esteem or feelings of membership, important as these may be. Naming contradictions or bringing conflict into the open disrupts belief systems; it stimulates the mental activity described by Piaget and others as leading to learning.

Airing or acting out competing viewpoints in class can provide students with the opportunity to clarify and deepen their knowledge. Formal social studies instruction alone does not necessarily have a net positive effect on students' political knowledge and attitudes; however, a social studies curriculum that uses specific conflicting perspectives as learning opportunities, that introduces conflictual subject matter and/or that facilitates conflictual pedagogical processes can make a difference, at least for the average student (Ehman, 1980; Grossman, 1976; also Avery, 1992; Duggan et al., 1986; Goldenson, 1978). Social studies instruction that increases student familiarity and practice with the points of view of other groups, nations, and cultures may teach students the skills and inclination to manage conflict in their democratic society.

Students who have lived through violence or exclusion may be exceptionally aware and skilled at this kind of expanded thinking when such topics are put on the academic agenda. After all, these students have had the most practice in dealing with conflict (Merelman, 1990):

Those who are pushed out of the tribe for being different are likely to become more sensitized (when not brutalized into insensitivity)....Those who are pounced on the most have it the strongest—the females, the homosexuals of all races, the dark skinned, the outcast, the persecuted, the marginalized, the foreign....It's a kind of survival tactic that people, caught between the worlds, unknowingly cultivate (Anzaldúa, 1987, pp. 38-39).

Young people who have been marginalized or who have lived in unstable societies have already practiced conflict, and have practiced juggling their own points of view among different and dominant viewpoints. To incorporate this type of expertise into the school

curriculum is to provide a wider range of students with the opportunity to learn, and to provide especially challenged students with the opportunity to excel.

Education for Citizenship in a Conflictual Society

Social conflict is inherent to a pluralistic society. The human diversity in current U.S. classrooms is not in itself conflictual, but it holds the potential for conflict. Instead of being approached as a potential source of knowledge and inspiration, difference among students is often given as a rationale for building consensus through social studies. One approach to the diversity of school and citizen populations is to emphasize a shared and mythical past—highlighting the voices of heroes and former leaders to prepare students for unity and stability (see also Sewall, 1988):

Migrants from Asia, Africa, and Latin America have filled our classrooms with students whose ethnic and cultural background is not 'Western.' They need a past they can share with Americans of European descent; and equally, Americans of European descent need a past they can share with all their fellow citizens (William McNeill, in National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, 1989, p. 53).

Wisely and intelligently designed, what has come to be known as the multicultural curriculum is a tool with which to broaden and transmit the common culture that we all share....It is the job of public education to teach everyone, whatever their ancestry, that we are all Americans and we all reside in the same world (Ravitch, 1990, p.18).

A contrasting approach to diversity is to emphasize the speed and scope of change in the nation and the world, highlighting multiple and sometimes challenging new voices in order to prepare students for social progress and for participation in the redress of inequalities (Banks, 1990; Belenky et al., 1986; Boulding, 1988; Kelly & Nihlen, 1982; Ladson-Billings, 1992; Giroux, 1988; Horton & Freire, 1990; Merelman, 1990; Sigel, 1990). The latter view emphasizes conflict and change:

Education for democratic citizenship in a global age calls for a new look at our past and a greater concern for our future....Narrow nationalism, dogmatic ideologies, and an endangered environment are luxuries humans can no longer afford (Becker, 1990, p. 70).

There have been movements to reform social education curriculum, reflecting recurring conflicts over values in the larger society, for about as long as there has been public education (Cuban, 1990). Notable among such movements for change and deserving much fuller discussion than space allows here have been those promoting multicultural, peace/conflict, and global/international education (e.g., AEGIS et al., 1989; Anderson, 1979; Brock-Utne, 1989; Lamy, 1991; McCarthy, 1988; Nieto, 1991; Reardon, 1990; Sleeter & Grant, 1987; Wein, 1987). The educational experiences valued by these movements include conflicting viewpoints as an opportunity to enrich understanding and openness:

Broadly conceived, multicultural education expresses a desire to have the school experience closely reflect those realities of pluralism and cultural diversity that exist within the society itself (Crichlow et. al., 1990, p. 101).

The dismal state of U.S. citizens' knowledge about either the rest of the world or the nondominant cultures in our midst has been well documented (e.g., Jencks, 1985; Joy, 1990; Torney, 1977).

The paradox of democratic education is that these two societal needs—for stability and for change—exist simultaneously. As Cuban points out, they are not dichotomous issues that can be won, lost, or solved by miracles: "They are dilemmas that require political negotiation and compromises," and they are balanced somewhat differently on the tightrope of each teacher's curriculum (1990, p. 8). Educator management of this dilemma is rooted in particular understandings of what constitutes social studies knowledge (Berlak & Berlak, 1981). On one hand, knowledge may be seen as static *content* to be mastered, like the past that McNeill and Ravitch see as shared and true (thus unchangeable). This view minimizes conflict. On the other hand, knowledge may be seen as a dynamic *process* that invites participation and change by including the multiple "voices, experiences, and perspectives" that are integral to the national culture (Banks, 1990, p. 2). In the latter view, knowledge is constructed out of specific social and temporal locations; it can be challenged and reconstructed to fit new realities. This view recognizes the potential of conflict as a learning opportunity.

Any implemented social studies curriculum falls somewhere between these two extremes, and carries contradictory elements of both. The current research project 'unpacks' this bundle of contradictions by identifying and getting to know particular teachers who exemplify different responses to this dilemma, and by observing the interactions of various kinds of students with the different implemented social studies curricula shaped by those teachers' decisions.

Social Studies Curriculum: Drama Expunged of Conflict?

In spite of its potential value for learning, U.S. social studies curricula commonly avoid conflict. Texts and teaching resources present a bland consensus-oriented view of political, economic, and historical processes (Anyon, 1979; Trecker, 1974). The origins of ideas are rarely specified much less claimed by the authors themselves. Instead, actions are attributed to an undefined *we*. The authors of a typical high school social studies text, for example, *American Government in Action*, describe conflict avoidance in their writing process:

Of course we both have private prejudices...but we made a scrupulous effort to hide them from our readers, if only because no one would buy the book if we didn't (Resnick & Nierenberg in Novak et al., 1978, p. 44).

The conventional wisdom is to provide different perspectives but to hide author prejudice by restricting viewpoints to a narrow range and by using passive voice and/or past tense to deal with conflictual information. No view (or only one) is developed thoroughly enough for a student to consider it seriously as a point of view regarding a contestable truth. Social studies knowledge is presented traditionally as static, neutral, and purged of conflict, passively supportive of the status quo rather than representative of the more complicated pluralistic society in which students actually live.

Who and what defines the central political 'we' presented in schools and especially in social studies curricula? To some degree, the school system reproduces and legitimates the social hierarchy, protecting the privileged position of economic and cultural elites (e.g., Apple, 1979; Barbagli & Dei, 1977; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Carnoy & Levin, 1985; McCarthy, 1988; Spender & Sarah, 1988). Schools reinforce different attitudes and behaviors for children from different backgrounds by teaching a hidden curriculum of political consensus and passivity and by operating with unchallenged language and values that are well understood and comfortable for some and foreign to others (Delpit, 1988).

Students commonly encounter not only conventional textbooks, but also conventional pedagogy. Only about one fifth of the social studies teachers Ehman interviewed a generation ago mentioned teaching goals "which could, using generous definitions, be allocated into the critical thinking and value analysis modes" (1970, p. 80). The social studies teachers studied by Goodlad (after critical thinking had received more media attention) said they intended to develop student ability to reason, but he found that they actually tested and rewarded something else—the memorization of endless names, dates, and slogans

(1985). Official curricular goals emphasize critical thinking (and thus the use of conflict as a learning opportunity), but the context, training, and daily demands with which social studies teachers work create an entirely different effect in implemented curricula. Many students learn to tune out this kind of fragmented and conflict-sanitized information (McNeil, 1981).

By the time they are in their latter years of high school, students appear to be remarkably resilient to what must be termed conventional modes of teaching and teacher behavior (Ehman, 1980, p. 227).

Grossman affirmed Ehman's demonstration of student resilience to ordinary social studies (1976). He showed no association between the number of high school social studies courses a student had taken and teacher-valued outcomes such as tolerance for dissent. The few courses that were explicitly devoted to controversial issues, however, did correlate with both student interest in social studies and tolerance for dissent. Avery and her colleagues constructed curricula to facilitate direct application of democratic principles to conflicts with specifically unpopular groups (using conflict in curricular process as well as content), and demonstrated that such curricula increase political tolerance among students (1992, also Goldenson, 1978). Social studies curricula that make constructive use of conflict are not common, but they can exist, and courses that use conflict in constructive ways have been shown to be more effective in educating the average student.

Teachers who encourage behavioral or substantive conflict to teach students thinking skills give up some control and predictability, risking trouble, embarrassment, and administrative difficulties. McNeil described the frequent practice of what she called 'defensive teaching' in several high school social studies classrooms (1986). Teachers deliberately simplified curricular content and lowered their demands on students in exchange for classroom order and compliance. They fragmented and simplified information into bits and lists, thereby eliminating relationships, complexity, and conflictual messages. Other points of view, actors, and time periods that might be controversial were simply omitted.

In this sweeping survey, students picked up the message that one does not need more than superficial knowledge about these other countries; the U.S. is the 'best' able to deal with all the diversity and conflict....The message of social studies content in the most controlling of these classes is that the system can be trusted, it does not need to be questioned, it does not need our active involvement. The classroom

about these other countries; the U.S. is the 'best' able to deal with all the diversity and conflict....The message of social studies content in the most controlling of these classes is that the system can be trusted, it does not need to be questioned, it does not need our active involvement. The classroom rewards for passive student roles have confirmed the value of acquiescence (McNeil, 1986, pp. 196, 208).

The foregoing work captures the synthesis of substantive conflict with pedagogical and behavioral conflict in social studies curricula. In order to avoid the control risks associated with conflictual behavior, teachers often eliminate conflictual topics and tasks from the implemented curriculum. Constructive confrontation of conflict provides a good opportunity to learn, but the social structure of mass schooling is more likely to model and reward the submersion of conflict. Social studies teachers manage this dilemma in a variety of ways. The similarities among their approaches shed light on the constraints of the social system, while the contrasts among them reveal the possibilities for improving social studies education to better promote inclusion in the dynamic processes of modern democracy.

New Research: Contrasting Case Studies

Research on social and political learning has had its limitations. Very few studies have focused on nondominant gender or ethnic groups, even though this variable has repeatedly proven to be an important correlate of socialization outcomes. Boys and girls, for example, consistently score differently on knowledge and attitude tests as do whites compared to nonwhites. This is evidence that being socialized together in a classroom does not guarantee the same socialization. The use of analysis limited to central tendencies of scores on written tests has obscured meaningful differences among the experiences of either students or their teachers, as well as the reasons for those differences. School factors were not or could not be pinned down with enough specificity to describe preferable teacher behaviors or effective curricular reforms. Furthermore, important skill development outcomes, because they are more difficult to measure with multiple-choice tests than knowledge and attitudes, have been disproportionately ignored. Exploratory research inside classrooms holds the potential to clarify the skills involved and the opportunities for all to learn them.

Statements about the average effects of social studies education mask an important problem: Confronting controversial/conflictual material can help some students while hindering others. Discussion formats could cause some students to be silenced by the complex or frightening topic; the unpredictable and public process, or the

voice in the context of social conflict, then what or who will? In-depth case study research complements the work cited above by helping to fill these gaps in the knowledge base from which social studies curricula are constructed.

Citizenship education has special importance for nonmajority, nondominant students, because these individuals are less likely to have opportunities to observe and practice political influence outside of school, compared to children of majority and dominant social groups. Urban public institutions, whose mandate includes the incorporation of diverse new citizens, are therefore a logical place to consider social studies curricular practice. Also, some kinds of conflict, especially in heterogeneous situations, can at times impede learning; in order to show conflict as a realistic learning opportunity, case studies must show conflict operating in the real world of changing public schools; therefore all of the cases in the present study are located in public classrooms populated by ethnically and economically diverse students, including new immigrants. In these social locations, inclusion in empowered citizenship is a highly relevant concern.

I was a participant observer for most of one school year several hours each per week in four public high school classrooms in two economically and ethnically diverse districts in the San Francisco Bay Area. The teachers were chosen to reflect substantial natural variation in the ways they did and did not use conflict as a learning opportunity in teaching social studies. Two of those teachers following identical district curriculum guidelines with similar groups of ninth-grade world studies students are the focus of this analysis. My intention was to observe contrasting versions of implemented social studies curricula in living form, including student as well as teacher words and deeds, rather than focusing on more accessible but less operationally accurate plans or materials. Observations were supplemented by informal interviews with teachers to give them an opportunity to explain and reflect upon their implemented curricula and upon my interpretation of it.

I chose three schools in two districts: North and East/West, because they served urban heterogeneous student populations. The chart that follows provides ethnicity information for each school as a whole. All schools are in economically mixed areas, chosen because they are neither the wealthiest nor the poorest in the region. Within each school, I looked for teachers who had extensive teaching experience, because (1) they would be most likely to have developed consistent personal teaching strategies, and (2) the research literature has associated the practice of classroom conflict with authority risks for teachers. Inexperienced teachers tend to have more difficulty establishing clear authority relations with students than do seasoned teachers; variation on this dimension could confuse results

Table 1
Ethnic Composition of Student Populations²

Ethnic Group	Percentage of students at each school		
	North	West	East
American Indian	0.1	0.2	0.3
Asian (other)	8.7	5.1	4.2
Filipino	10.2	0.9	1.6
Pacific Islander	5.5	1.7	3.0
Black	5.2	10.0	3.3
White (other)	37.3	54.2	49.4
Hispanic	33.0	27.8	38.5
Total # of students	1286	1404	1606

in a study focusing on conflict. All of the teachers were told explicitly about my research intentions and I offered only a listening ear for reflective conversation in exchange for their willingness to participate. A teacher could withdraw at any time (as one did, for health reasons, in the spring).

I looked to maximize contrast among a small number of teacher subjects along the two intersecting dimensions that have been identified in earlier literature: (1) amount of conflict presented in curricular content, and (2) amount of conflict allowed or encouraged in pedagogical processes. Initial observations and interviews were conducted with a range of potential teacher subjects to identify teachers who taught similar courses to similar students, yet contrasted sufficiently on these dimensions. I was fortunate to find four friendly and committed individuals. I chose a pair of teachers in each district, the first because of particularly notable approaches to teaching conflicting viewpoints in social studies, and the second to match demographics (teaching experience and the course/students they were teaching) yet to contrast approaches to conflict in social studies teaching. A pilot study was conducted at North High School in 1988-89 that helped to refine data collection strategies and led to the inclusion of U.S. history teachers Ken Jacobs and Tom Clark (see Bickmore, 1991 and 1993, for further discussion of these cases). The present discussion focuses on two

² Statistics are from 1989 school documents with categories determined by school officials: White and Black do not include those of Hispanic ancestry; Asian and Hispanic include both established citizens and recent immigrants.

teachers in the East/West school district, Ruth Murray and Sarah Gilbert, whom I observed during the 1989-1990 school year.

Selecting Teacher Subjects

Ruth Murray, a mentor teacher with over 20 years of experience, was recommended to me by staff members of an international education agency on the basis of her enthusiasm and experience in teaching critical thinking and international material. A preliminary observation and interview at her East High School classroom confirmed her use of conflicting viewpoints in her subject matter. Ruth agreed to participate in the study with the caveat that she would only be available during the first semester and that both of her classes were considered part of the advanced standing track. Both classes were ethnically diverse. Ruth believed that these classes were not particularly different from her standard track classes, and she taught them in the same manner (interview, January 3, 1989). In a controlled comparison using standard outcome measures, an advanced track class would have distorted research results. In this case study method, however, the potential difference provided an opportunity to inquire into Ruth's use of conflict as a learning opportunity in a pronounced situation; for example, her confidence in student ability could encourage her to demonstrate a wide repertoire of strategies for using conflict constructively in her teaching.

After observing and talking with four other teachers and an administrator in Ruth's district, I found an instructor at West High School teaching the same course. Sarah Gilbert was matched with Ruth in approximate age and teaching experience, yet I chose to work with her because she handled conflict differently from Ruth in her interpretation of the same district guidelines for ninth-grade world studies. West High School is at the wealthier end of the same consolidated district as East High School. A student may choose either school, but many students apparently go to the school closest to their home. Some economic differences in the classroom populations might be expected. The opposite tendency, however, is presented by the contrast between the advanced-standing populace at East High School versus the regular-standing students at West High School. Sarah agreed to participate in the study after a brief observation and interview session.

In summary, I sought maximum contrast among the teacher approaches to conflict in social studies education, within the specific scope I saw as particularly relevant to questions of inclusion in democratic citizenship—urban public classrooms of experienced teachers working with diverse students. Sarah's pedagogy centered around simple curricular content coupled with a very open climate of conflictual

discussion. Ruth built her curriculum around the presentation of conflictual information, especially multicultural and international perspectives, by means of tightly teacher-controlled pedagogical strategies. Their courses were standard requirements for high school graduation. Neither Ruth nor Sarah relied generally on a textbook. The rough dimensions of contrast I initially sought among the teacher subjects of these case studies are as follows:

		Curricular Content	
		less conflict	more conflict
Pedagogical Process	less conflict	(KEN)	RUTH
	more conflict	SARAH	(TOM)

Methodology

Data Collection

My research framework called for observing the teachers over an extended time, handling many different activities and topics with their students. Beginning in mid-September, I observed each teacher during two regular class periods, twice every week during the first semester, and one class period twice weekly per teacher in the second semester. Ruth left for a sabbatical leave at the end of January, and Sarah took an unplanned medical leave during the last week in March. My observations included viewing and reading all material assigned to the students and noting how the material was handled in practice by teachers and students.³

I gathered three kinds of data. First, I used a simple form that reminded me during each observation period to record topics of discussion, length of discussion and activities, types of task structures (i.e., organization of classroom work roles, such as lecture or small group work), and numbers of verbal actions by teacher and students. I made a hatchmark, for example, for each convergent and divergent question, and recorded the names of individuals who asked and responded to each question. I also kept copies of all material handed out to students. Second, my daily longhand notes recorded who participated, how they participated, what the subjects of verbal interactions were, and whether opposing viewpoints were expressed. Third, every two or three weeks

³Profiles of each teacher's background, context, and typical classroom practices are included in Bickmore, 1991.

(on average), I conducted informal interviews with each teacher and probed for perceptions, intentions, and explanations of classroom events. Teachers were always welcome to view and criticize my observation and interview notes, although in practice they rarely paid much attention to them. My classroom observation (not including interviews) totalled approximately 52 hours for Ruth and 68 hours for Sarah.

In December, I gave each teacher a copy of my first tentative analysis of her/his own use of conflict in teaching. I asked for criticism and reminded them that I was a beginner at this type of research and therefore was bound to be inaccurate initially. All of the teachers affirmed to a remarkable degree the portraits I presented of their work. Furthermore, the reflective discussions that resulted from this two-way risk taking initiated a generally deeper level of communication, and the mutual understanding it produced lasted through subsequent interviews (although Ruth left school a month later). This open type of discussion carries the risk of increasing the impact of researcher presence on teacher behavior, but it also holds the advantage of enhancing respectful dialogue between teacher and researcher. The few situations in which I sensed a possible change in a teacher's work as a result of our discussions are pointed out as they arise in the case studies (Bickmore, 1993).

Interviews with teachers were free flowing and often spontaneous in form. I wanted the teachers to express what they considered important or troubling about their teaching, and not simply to respond to my ideas. Without exception, the four teachers seemed willing and eager to talk to me, especially after the first few weeks. School structures tend to isolate teachers and to stymie their opportunities to reflect constructively upon their teaching with peers⁴. Admittedly, their willingness to talk was one criterion for their selection, but these teachers went beyond that obligation. Often in a spare moment before or after class, a teacher would begin talking to me about his/her teaching. I often reminded them that they were in a research interview by interrupting, "Wait! That's interesting. Let me write that down." When I did use prompts or probes, they were generalized questions such as, "How do you think that went today?" or "Will you tell me why you chose that activity?" Thus, classroom conflicts (if any) were brought up by the teacher rather than placed on the agenda by the researcher.

I observed the same class periods for each teacher over several months in order to become familiar with the names and behaviors of specific students. All of the students were introduced to me, were told of my interest in conflict in social studies teaching, and were assured of confidentiality. I had access to seating charts in every class in order to learn the names of all the students. My intention was to obtain a detailed

⁴See Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1991; Lortie, 1975; Shulman, 1986.

picture of the implemented curriculum, including who participated in the educational environments the teachers constructed. I wanted to explore the interface between the curriculum and the various individuals in each classroom rather than to assume that the curriculum was unidirectional and the same for any average student or for the class as a whole.

In the classroom, I was an unobtrusive participant-observer. I sat at a table by the side of the room or at a student desk, watching and taking notes in much the way any quiet student does in class. In the more participatory, less teacher-centered classrooms, I interacted more. While I did not participate directly in students' small group or individual tasks, interactive structures occasionally allowed me to move around the classroom listening to students work as well as watching the teacher. After the first month I learned also to record names of students who spoke or acted publicly during lessons to help me notice unusual participation and silences. In the more interactive classrooms, it was fairly common for a student to ask me a simple question as they would their peers; for example, "What page are we on?" or "How are you supposed to fill in this map?" If I knew the answer based on what I heard in class, I gave brief responses to such questions. Most of the time, however, I was ignored. My role in the structure and activity of any classroom was so unimportant to the students that I quickly began to feel invisible. After the first week or so, nobody paid much attention to me.

From the above recording strategy, I found that a commonality among the classrooms was that a large number of students—sometimes as many as half the class—had learned a trick of invisibility oddly similar to the invisibility I had developed as an observer. Classroom activities did not revolve around these students any more than they revolved around me, a stranger with no direct role in the educational process. These students completed their work to one extent or another, kept to themselves, and rarely spoke out. I felt that the involvement of the otherwise uninvolved might be a clue to the salience of certain pedagogical events. The concern for inclusion that emerged from this finding helped to shape my later analysis and led to the present article.

I kept detailed notes about the basic topics of each lesson, the conflicts (if any) that came up during each observation, the attitudes expressed as well as the names of those who expressed them, and my observations of how class members seemed to engage in the material they were presented. In order not to prejudge the educational relevance of particular conflicts, I tried to record everything from mild procedural disagreements to substantive criticism and analysis of opposing perspectives. An assigned textbook passage, for example, that merely stated, "Some people think...other people think" would be included in my field notes. As a way to tie the educational use of conflict to specific evidence and implications, I noted the various ways in which each

teacher represented key social studies concepts to their students, even when I was not certain at the time whether or not any given representation was conflictual.

My criteria for recording conflicts in my field notes were of course based on the impressions of one observer over time rather than on a true picture of what occurred. I tried to record only expressed conflicts, ones that a participant in the class had a chance of noticing; I did not attempt to read minds. Any time I perceived a trace of a disagreement—either in the material, in the teacher's explanation, or in a student response—I wrote down the voices that I (and any attentive student) could hear or see. Even with this open scope, however, there were many days when I had no conflict of any kind to record. The relative intensity of the various conflicts I observed is communicated through situated narratives regarding the substance and behavior of particular interactions.

I wanted to understand the overall messages left by several months' immersion in these classrooms. To emphasize the student perspective, I used no electronic aids, only paper and pen. Because my general expectation proved correct, that classroom conflict is very often avoided, the recording task was not as overwhelming as might be imagined. Even without a tape recorder, my impressions are considerably more detailed than those of most students for two reasons: (1) I have had experience with lots of social studies classes and classes about social studies classes; therefore, I had access to mental categories that helped me remember and construct meaning from my experiences; and (2) I paid attention even when the class was deadly boring! I saw much of what I imagine many students saw, in addition to some things they may have missed, although all data were filtered through my subjective frame of reference.

Data Analysis

Erickson wrote, "American classrooms are odd not only in terms of what happens there, but in terms of what *does not happen*" (1972, p. 16, emphasis in original). This axiom certainly applies to the study of conflict. He advocates methods derived from ethnography for studying what is obvious and what is taken for granted, examining their meanings to classroom participants. Classroom conflict carries a dazzling array of unwritten rules, understandings, and attitudes. The processes by which conflict is identified as such, is or is not allowed to occur, and affects participants are filtered and constrained by countless cultural and individual factors.

The method and scope of this study place conflict somewhere between two kinds of case studies that are common in recent literature. Because this is a study of implemented curricula, I used the classroom level focus found in the snapshot type cases that highlight a moment of classroom interaction (e.g., Shulman & Mesa-Baines, 1990). To

substantiate my study of enduring patterns in curricular practice, I used the much broader time frame and supplementary interviews typical of sociological or ethnographic case studies of whole-school cultures (e.g., Jackson, 1968; Metz, 1978; McNeil, 1986). In analyzing the mountains of data from almost a year of fieldwork, I read, reread, and discussed vignettes with colleagues, looking for emergent questions, themes, and patterns. As in any meaningful human relationship, I was changed by my research experience; I have pointed out some situations that expose my evolving subjectivity in the case studies that follow (also see Bickmore, 1991).

In summary, I immersed myself in selected classroom environments for several months, and informed both students and teachers in advance of my interest in conflict in their classroom learning situations. My presence, however, was so continuous for such a lengthy period that any attempt to put on a show for me would have been difficult and unlikely. Students mostly ignored me, since I had no role in the system that regulated their behavior. Teachers seemed eager to share their thoughts about their curriculum and teaching because I was a sympathetic adult present in their work environment. The combined result of these research strategies is a detailed picture of contrasting implemented social studies curricula in comparable multiethnic contexts and a flavor of each teacher's reflections about his/her own work.

Research Questions

In this project, I was concerned with the contrasting ways social studies teachers use conflict as a learning opportunity in similar urban public high school classes. The questions with which I approached the case studies are these: (1) How did the teachers use (and avoid using) conflict in the curricular content and/or the pedagogical manner in which they presented social studies; how did conflict shape their representations of key social studies/citizenship ideas; and (2) what did various students practice doing in these social studies classroom laboratories, and how might this behavior model inclusion or exclusion in the larger political society; is conflictual curriculum more intrinsically engaging for some students, and/or does it contribute to the silencing of other students.

Within this research framework, I focused on the problem of inclusion—the citizenship education of subordinate groups—in Sarah Gilbert's and Ruth Murray's ninth-grade classes (the same world studies course in the same multiethnic school district) because of the contrast they provide in their curricular strategies between emphasis on conflictual content and conflictual pedagogy⁵. As indicated above,

⁵The case of Tom Clark (who used conflictual subject-matter and conflictual pedagogical strategies in his U.S. history curriculum) is discussed in Bickmore, 1993. All four case

inclusion is a theme that gained prominence for me as a result of my experiences in the research process. If one learns by observing models and by practicing, then the silent students common to each teacher's classroom were practicing different citizenship-relevant skills and roles than were their more assertive peers. Two dimensions of this problem, with which I analyze the case studies below, are as follows: (1) *Learning inclusion* is facilitated by representation of society's pluralist aspect: the existence and importance of diversity, dissent, and debate. Did teachers soften the exclusionist tendencies of typical social studies resources by adding to or interrogating prepared materials? This dimension replicates and extends earlier research literature generally focused on textbook resources; (2) *Inclusion in learning* involves participation in face-to-face confrontation of conflicting ideologies or viewpoints: How did the teachers actually practice the inclusion of various student voices in the laboratory of classroom discourse? My exploratory study of this dimension may help to inform further citizenship education research.

Ruth Murray: World Studies as Crosscultural Literacy

Ruth teaches ninth-grade world studies at East High School—the same course in the same district as Sarah Gilbert. She was the head of her social studies department the year the fieldwork was conducted (1989–90), and is a mentor teacher with more than 20 years' experience known for her competency and enthusiasm by a local agency for international education. Her cheerful voice can be heard from the hallway. The walls of the room are a testimony to Ruth's interest and experience in global education. The bulletin boards include student work and colorful pictures from the Middle East, India, Africa, Japan, China, and Latin America. A rack by the door holds copies for students of the many current and recent handouts Ruth uses to supplement her occasional use of textbooks. Grades for each class are posted on another bulletin board. Ruth also teaches government. Posters and news magazine photos of U.S. political figures grace another wall. The room is packed with student desks in straight rows facing the chalkboard, a small work table sits in the back, and the teacher's desk and an overhead projector are in the front.

Ruth Murray's students are expected to demonstrate mastery of information and application of concepts within a teacher-controlled framework. With her consent, I have labeled her perspective *crosscultural literacy* to highlight her emphasis on acquisition of basic information before making value judgments. Ruth sets a firm agenda and firm parameters in her classroom. Open disagreement, even among student

studies, including Ken Jacobs (who avoided conflict in his U.S. history curriculum), are discussed in Bickmore, 1991.

peers, is rare. Behavioral norms are enforced; e.g., when one student called a peer's idea stupid, Ms. Murray turned to him and said, speaking loudly and pointing her finger, "We don't use that word in here, *ever!*" (November 15, period 2). Peer interactions were usually minimal and mediated by the teacher; behavioral conflict was virtually invisible.

Learning Inclusion

Ruth Murray began her world studies course by teaching the notion of culture systematically, as a concept to be understood. The class read a short definitional piece for homework and then reviewed it in class, led by Ruth using the overhead projector. Students listed "the five characteristics of culture" around which Ruth had organized the first reading, giving examples of each characteristic (culture is learned, involves behavior accepted as normal by other members of the society, etc.). Ruth prompted, "Where does one sex go around all covered up?" Students made various guesses, including India; Ruth said no until somebody guessed "Arabia" and "the Middle East." She then pointed out that this behavior had to do with religion, which is cultural (September 21).

The same day, Ruth assigned groups of two to four students to apply their new knowledge by deciding which items on a printed list reflected culture and which were inherited. She encouraged students to identify disagreements and to defend their own responses (using conflict as a learning opportunity) but within about five minutes, students were back in the large group and each item had been resolved into one correct answer. The teacher explained the items upon which students still disagreed, writing answers on the overhead screen for students to copy into their notes (September 21). The next day, the class took a true/false quiz on this material. The answers were reviewed for the class in two minutes, without discussion; for example, these were all true:

- If I look at a person I can see some of his culture.
- Culture allows people to live together comfortably.
- Eating with a knife, fork, and spoon is the American way to eat and is the right way for Americans to eat (September 22).

The juxtaposition of true and false answers suggested that the American way is not the only acceptable way of doing things. Yet this quiz and other activities also suggested internal consensus, implying that there is one identifiable American culture with preferable ways of behaving.

The end of the same class period was taken up with what Ruth called a culture quiz. This was not graded; Ruth read aloud the questions from a trivia book. She told the students, with her eyes twinkling to show that she was teasing:

How many of you are culturally normal? Let's see who's normal. Remember you're not adults: Normal for you may be four or five [correct answers]....These are all things you would pick up from your culture if you've been alive. You may be culturally deprived.

- What is the first day of Lent?
- How many members are there in the U.S. Senate?
- What do Spanish Americans mean by 'gringo'?
- What is the main vegetable in coleslaw? (September 22, period 2).

Although this activity was conducted in a spirit of fun, one wonders what a student who performed poorly on it, one of several recent immigrants in the class for example, might have felt. Here, U.S. culture was defined as normal mainstream knowledge.

Ruth Murray saw school knowledge as incontestable fact. Her curriculum was tightly structured and information oriented. In the following unit on race, she led students to fill out a chart on the traits of the three major races. First she clarified that major here referred only to larger numbers and not to superiority, and that there is considerable diversity within each racial group: whites (Caucasoids) aren't really white in color, yellows (Mongoloids) aren't really yellow, and blacks (Negroids) aren't really black. The chart listed normal skin and eye colors, nose and eye shapes, hair color and texture, and height for each of the three groups. The lesson taught about difference without dwelling on the conflicts often associated with that difference, except that Ruth told her class that race is sometimes confused with culture and that the idea "is misused a great deal" (September 28, period 1).

Ruth pointed out similarities and differences within each racial category by pointing to specific members of the class. This caused considerable squirming and giggling. One student of Asian origin objected strenuously, "I'm not Mongoloid!" (apparently associating the term with Downs Syndrome). Ruth persisted in treating the matter as neutral information, saying only, "This is not funny." The issue of prejudice was handled with the films, *Eye of the Storm* (about the blue-eyed, brown-eyed experiment led by a teacher in Iowa) and *They* (an allegory about in-groups and point of view), but there was virtually no time for class discussion of this controversial material. Student essays about the films indicated that most had understood the personal-level issues regarding self-esteem, but few had grasped the idea of power or privilege (notes, October 3).

In most class sessions, Ruth used a drill format, asking 15 or more convergent vocabulary or informational questions to which students volunteered answers. She asked a few divergent questions, not eliciting

feelings or opinions but asking for examples of the phenomena on her agenda. She systematically introduced content information that included diverse points of view (hence potential conflicts), but treated the information as reducible to right or wrong answers. She assigned reading about different ethnic groups in Latin America (October 17-19), for example, and used a filmstrip and stories to represent examples of different teenager and family lives at different economic locations in Latin America (October 25, 26, 30). Her control of classroom discourse was remarkable. Almost everything said in class seemed to fit into a clear framework of instructional objectives. As a result, student feelings, including acceptance or rejection of other human ways of life, rarely were given voice in Ruth Murray's classroom.

One counterexample provides a sense of what some students might have been thinking. The unit on Latin America provided a context for an introduction to economics, including the concept of social class. Lessons described the class structures of Latin America and the United States, using the conceptual power of contrast but not discussing class conflict in either context (October 24):

After drilling the class on definitions of terms, Ruth asked the class for examples of upper- and then lower-class residences in this country. Joanna volunteered, laughing, "The street corner—bums!" A few other students chuckled. The teacher replied, "Not just bums, but we have a whole new class of people living on the street now—the homeless." Then she changed the subject, eliciting examples of lower-class residences in Latin America (September 24th, period 2).

Conflict was acknowledged and placed on Ruth's curricular agenda, but it generally was not discussed. Her unit on religions of the world (situated within a Middle East unit) was presented with a chart contrasting Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Principal beliefs were listed in the bottom row of boxes, preceded by ten other categories of information, including:

- Century in which it started
- Name of its founder
- Holy book
- Day of worship
- Area of the world where it is most prominent (December 14).

Again, conflicting practices and beliefs were presented as neutral facts, and were not discussed as values or as sources of continuing social conflict.

The next day's reading assignment raised the question, "Where do laws come from?" Examples included "some rules generally observed by Saudi Arabians": intoxication is punished with 80 lashes (40 lashes if the drinker is a slave); thievery is punished with dismemberment; women are (considered) inferior to men and must wear veils; and eating is properly conducted using the right hand only and after one's shoes have been removed. The handout, using a passive voice to minimize any notion of social conflict, explained:

Societies discover that a certain way of acting causes problems. To avoid that problem, a rule is made up which prohibits the way of acting. The rule may come from an authority and be written down, or it may simply become accepted over a long period of time. The actual procedure isn't important. It is more important to know that rules usually begin as practical solutions to real problems (December 15).

Students were instructed to read this list of presumably unfamiliar practices or stereotypes about Arab culture and to list a problem that might have been solved by each rule. Conflict was presented as past and as solved by somebody else; Ruth's students did not deal with the conflict directly or place themselves in the role of problem solver.

Ruth Murray was conscientious and consistent about embedding in her world studies lessons the idea that human history includes groups with opposing interests and different viewpoints; thus, she did want her students to learn about inclusion. This was not based on discussions or exhortations to view material in particular ways but rather on the structured presentation of factual information about nondominant as well as dominant groups; however, her students did not often criticize information or its sources, or practice responding to cultural or ideological differences.

Inclusion in Learning

As the vignettes above demonstrate, Ruth's teaching relied heavily on confident students to volunteer answers to teacher questions, and did not emphasize broad student participation. In December, I gave each teacher a written summary of what I had seen and interpreted in observing their classes thus far, and discussed it with them. For Ruth Murray, this feedback and discussion may have had an exceptionally strong impact on her curricular strategies during the remainder of the Middle East unit, which resumed after the winter break. Ruth told me that she had not realized just how little class time she had been allocating for discussion or critical thinking regarding course material.

I think discussion requires a depth of knowledge on the students' part....I'm torn between having a discussion and giving them enough knowledge....I think kids feel very frustrated in discussion groups unless I structure them: Find this, now find this. [Why?] Because they don't know what they're talking about. I'm torn. Should I be teaching the content and the history, or should I be letting them deal with feelings? I need to do the content *first*, so I don't get much time for the second (interview, January 5).

Clearly, Ruth Murray saw her primary role as provider of conceptually structured information rather than as facilitator of practice for democratic participation.

I observed an activity in Ruth's two subsequent classes that was extraordinarily different from anything else I had observed before, especially in those classes. What follows is an abridged version of the field notes I scribbled after class. This passage is included to expose the way I was thinking about the evidence I gathered in these case studies:

There was a marked difference between today's real conflict—a debate in which the class was physically organized on opposite sides of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and directed to express any and all opinions to each other—and yesterday's teacher-directed perspective identification exercise. When I suddenly see real conflict [voices raised, faces animated, a chorus of "Yeah, but....," "No!" "Wait!" and a depth of engagement in which nothing else is apparently going on in participants' minds], it makes me wonder whether I should be calling the other stuff [different opinions or viewpoints expressed quietly and without emotion] conflict at all.

Yesterday, students read two dramatized views [of David, a fictional Israeli Jew, and Daud, a fictional Palestinian Arab, and their rights to the homeland]....Then [students each independently] wrote out the arguments given by one side. [Student volunteers gave] examples of these arguments for the teacher to record on the overhead transparency screen, taking one view at a time. [By the end of class January 8, the two viewpoints were side by side on the screen, but there was no discussion or even (verbal) comparison of the ideas].

Today, [Ms. Murray] introduced the activity by defining the word *controversy* and encouraging the taking of positions and stating of arguments. Student desks were set up in a

debate structure, facing one another along three sides of the room....Each student chose her/his position (pro-Israeli, pro-Palestinian, or undecided) and was instructed to physically move to one of the other sections of the room if/when they changed their opinion. [Here is an amazing natural experiment regarding the potential for conflict to stimulate cognitive change!] [Student] voices were loud and emotional; arguments were essentially shouted at the other side; most students who participated spoke several times. Instead of their usual...monosyllabic responses to convergent teacher questions, students spoke in a whole sentence (or two, usually under a minute per speech), explaining and defending their opinions with evident energy (January 9).

This incident lends support to the argument that conflict is inherently interesting, and that it motivates thought and cognitive change. Several students, for example, gave detailed reasons for their opinions, responding directly to objections from the other side by clarifying and elaborating their own arguments. When they did this, their voices usually rose in (emotional) pitch, indicating that they were responding to their opponents by identifying with and deepening their viewpoints in a way that other pedagogies would not have encouraged them to do.

Several students (at least 6 of the 30 in period 1 and at least 8 of the 28 in period 2) also changed their viewpoints (and their physical positions, as instructed) during the debate. Most notably, the number who were willing or able to take a position increased dramatically in both classes. The total number sitting on the undecided side dropped from 14 to 10 in period 1, even though someone on the Israeli side changed to undecided (and the size of the Palestinian delegation doubled from 3 to 6). The total number of undecided dropped from 7 to 2 in period 2, while others also changed sides entirely, and the Palestinian delegation grew from 7 to 10.

Assuming that students learn by doing, this exercise must have been particularly effective, because more students participated more frequently and more extensively (number, length, and quality of responses) than in any other activity I witnessed in Ruth's classes. In period 1 on this day of the debate, 21 of the 30 students spoke (publicly, on the topic, and to the entire class; in both classes, additional students spoke on the topic but privately to a neighbor), most of them repeatedly and at length, as compared to 15 out of 29 the day before (which was a typical day—students gave at most one or two short answers to convergent questions). Compared to other activities in the same class, the quantity and the atmosphere of student involvement in this learning activity was as different as morning is from night. How much of the

difference was due to the interesting conflictual topics, and how much was due to the opportunity to learn provided by the pedagogical strategies in which students had the floor?

A natural experiment the same day (January 9) shed light on the comparative importance of conflictual content or process in enhancing inclusion: A substitute teacher, Mr. X, took over the period 2 class after the first 20 minutes of the 50-minute period when Ruth had to leave for an appointment. Eighteen of the 28 students spoke publicly (repeatedly and at length) during period 2 on this day. This is remarkable because the substitute teacher, unlike Ruth who had stood back and watched while she was in charge of the discussion, took up about half of the total speaking time while he was present. The (typical) day before in period 2, only 9 of 26 students had spoken even one word to the teacher or to the class. On the debate day, students entered into the discussion readily at the beginning of class, with no student capturing the floor and no one audibly putting down anyone else. When Mr. X came in and began participating, however, many students were literally silenced (even though this teacher would not be grading them in any way). Mr. X frequently outshouted the loudest students, interrupting to guide the substantive focus of discussion or to direct the process. His interventions were instructive, and they were made with smiles. Nevertheless, many students, including some who normally spoke in this class, were not allowed to speak or were cut off before finishing their points (giving their reasons). Less confident students simply stopped talking after Mr. X became involved in the activity.

This incident shows that conflict alone—even pedagogy that explicitly encourages active participation, multiple viewpoints, or perspective identification—is not enough to stimulate extraordinary student participation and critical thought. Students also need real opportunities to participate. This inclusion in learning requires different strategies for different students. For some confident students, an open-ended and interesting task was enough to include them. Others who were much more active in this debate than in ordinary lessons apparently needed space on the floor to be heard without direct teacher intervention or evaluation. A full third of the students in both of these class sections, however, never spoke at all even during this debate. Whatever might be required to include them in learning (in this case, practice at speaking publicly) never took place in the months I observed their class.

Ruth Murray laid a basis for future participation of her students in a pluralistic society by broadening considerably their exposure to detailed information about unfamiliar people, places, and cultures. This emphasis on content meant that her students did not often practice in the classroom the skills associated with democratic participation. Ruth's students almost never publicly evaluated or responded to course

material aloud or during class time. The curriculum was considerably distant from the conflicts that these ideas generate in human life. Ruth's curriculum, therefore, may have broadened student understanding of pluralistic ideas without necessarily leading students to see themselves as included among democratic decision makers.

Sarah: World Studies as Global Village Encounter

Sarah Gilbert teaches ninth-grade world studies at West High School in the same district as Ruth. She has been teaching for almost 30 years. She opens nearly every session of class with a ritual "Hello, everyone!" (Students respond, "Hi, Sarah," or "Hi, Ms. Gilbert!") She then spends a few minutes moving from desk to desk, speaking quietly for a moment with each student, monitoring homework, and answering questions. Desks are arranged in a double semicircle around the chalkboard. This arrangement, and the pedagogy it implies, facilitates student-to-student mutual aid and discussion, and enables the teacher to see and hear every student. The room is filled almost constantly with a hubbub of voices. Disciplinary matters are often handled by means of short private encounters after class between student and teacher. As one student left for lunch after such a dialogue, Sarah looked him in the eye and said, "I want you to learn in here. Do you want to learn in here?" "Yes," he answered. "Good. See you tomorrow" (September 20, period 4).

Sarah's lessons focused on experiencing and responding to differences, especially differences of culture or values. Geography lessons, for example, often began with a student or the teacher telling a story about a place they had lived or visited or with an examination of stories embedded in films or photographs. Every topic seemed to stimulate discussion. Student voices were heard more than the teacher's, and disagreement was common between student and teacher as well as among students. When students responded either to one another's opinions or to unfamiliar cultural phenomena with negative comments, Sarah affirmed the value of multiple viewpoints and enforced norms of respectful behavior by specifically complimenting people for asking questions and raising constructive criticisms (e.g., October 27, February 8, 22).

Learning Inclusion

Sarah Gilbert's students were invited to experience and discuss their feelings and prejudices about cultures and ideologies different from their own. Sarah did not structure many lessons with vocabulary or specific social science concepts, although she sometimes used those to initiate a discussion topic; for example, she presented current news material about the Dalai Lama of Tibet in a journalism unit (October 10-

23), and films and text on Japanese culture in an area studies unit (February 22-March 30), as examples of ways in which specific other people see the world. She invited her students to respond with their feelings and opinions about the unfamiliar belief systems they encountered in the world studies curriculum. She tried with mixed success to keep those responses within bounds of respect for different cultures or belief systems. In the unit on Japan, for example, she explained to her class:

We're talking about people who do not see the world as we see it. They are not us....Japan is oriented toward group identity and family. Here in the U.S. we are [more] individualistic (March 20, period 4).

Sarah framed her representations of the world in terms of what she called a *global village*. This theme was introduced to the students at the beginning of the year as a metaphor for environmental and resource-based interdependence. The course began within a local context—the theme of the U.S. as a nation of immigrants made up of diverse regions—and then expanded to include additional parts of the world and various approaches to studying them. As Sarah's curriculum moved from thematic units on journalism, political science, and economics into area studies, she wove the global village motif in and out of each topic. The central theme of her lessons on culture was respect for difference. The breadth of social science information she presented about human differences or similarities was limited by the time spent with the entire class discussing, processing, and responding to that information.

Sarah used current events to illustrate world studies concepts with the explicit intention of inviting student involvement, questions, and opinions on the material; for example, the unit on political systems around the world used recent events in Romania to explain the characteristics of dictatorship (January 3, periods 4 & 5). The responses of Romanian citizens to the dictatorship after it had been overthrown and after information became available were analyzed collectively. More significantly, students were invited to take on the perspectives of Romanians: "Think about the execution of Ceaucescu from a Romanian perspective," Ms. Gilbert asked. "How would you feel?" She used approximately 10 convergent questions in each class to clarify information and confirm understanding, and then spent the bulk of each period soliciting and responding to student-initiated questions or comments about the material. To generate more student responses, she used a straw vote: "How many approve? How many disapprove? How many don't care?" Students who took each position were then asked to explain the reasons for their opinions, while the teacher reaffirmed the

validity of each person's opinion. Ground rules in Sarah's classes focused on being involved, initiating ideas, and listening respectfully to others.

Sarah introduced unfamiliar viewpoints in her curriculum, and also taught ways of understanding and managing that unfamiliarity. Beginning her unit on Japan, for example, Sarah asked students to identify and list their feelings of discomfort or rejection about Japanese practices, and then taught them what she called a culture chant. Her express purpose in using this activity was not only to model inclusion, but also to assert and to apply to specific cases the right to be different. When somebody said, for example, "Eeeuw! That's weird," the class was instructed to add, "but I was raised in a different culture and learned to like different things" (February 22). This did not seem to have the effect of squelching dissent, judging from the number of students who disagreed publicly with the teacher in class. One day, for example, a student asserted that his own way of life was superior to the culture they were studying. Sarah disagreed directly, but at the same time, she let the young man and his peers have their say for about 15 minutes:

Vince: The question is, which way of life is better—the American way, or the Japanese way?

Ms. Gilbert: No! Why can't we just agree that the two ways are different, not better or worse?

Vince reasserted his position, and several students joined on both sides of the discussion. Four boys and a girl openly challenged the teacher's position that U.S. culture should not necessarily be considered superior, and a comparable number defended her view. I noticed that several usually reluctant students looked up and were listening intently; silent Jon actually lifted his drooping head and made an on-topic comment to his neighbors. For about three minutes there were many voices at once, then the discussion wrapped up at a calmer pace (March 20th, period 4).

As if the world were a small village, Sarah asked students to confront specific cultural differences as well as bioenvironmental challenges with their feelings as well as their minds. She emphasized learning the concept of inclusion, in contrast to Ruth's emphasis on including vast quantities of information about subordinate or unfamiliar peoples in the curriculum. Lessons moved back and forth from maps and written material to stories about people and ways of life in particular locations. Because these personal encounters could not actually take place face to face, Sarah brought in films and stories. She told me, "I think it's a lot better to show them a film [or an article] with some real

people in it than to give them a lecture [about names or dates]" (interview, February 20); thus Sarah presented her students with relatively little specific information but with emotionally potent images regarding unfamiliar human perspectives.

Inclusion in Learning

Sarah typically led at least part of each lesson with divergent, open-ended questions eliciting a range of student opinions and experiences. Almost every class period included dozens of questions or comments initiated by students, some of them considerably more than one sentence long, usually on general topics Ms. Gilbert introduced, but not necessarily in reply to her questions. Because of this open classroom atmosphere, many different voices were included in the curricular discourse. People very often disagreed; students directed comments and challenges to each other as well as to the teacher in whole class discussions; for example, students were asked to pursue independent world studies projects. Sarah engaged them in brainstorming ideas for project topics by asking questions such as, "How many of you have been outside the country or know somebody who has?" Then she called on students who had raised their hands to tell their stories. Because of the mixed-income background of the class, these students were few in number, and most had relatives who had been overseas in the military. Based on individual perceptions, student stories sometimes conflicted. The opinions they offered stimulated disagreement, which Sarah handled by giving the floor to each student who wanted to speak. She often addressed each student speaker by name and said, for example, "That was a very wise point..." before paraphrasing the statement in clearer terms (e.g., October 11, period 4). Her role was that of facilitator, broadening access to the floor for less aggressive students and clarifying social studies concepts.

Sometimes Sarah made use of her role as teacher to insist that students change their prejudiced behavior and (if possible) attitudes. Students were encouraged to ask questions about the news, which they did almost daily; sometimes this stimulated impromptu lessons on cultural or ideological differences. One day during the political systems unit, Sarah came in and told the class:

I want to talk about something somebody brought up in third period. This is extremely important to anybody who will be living in this political system. Write this down [demonstrates on board]: NEONAZISM. [She defined *neo* and then said:] What does the word *Nazism* mean to you?

Chris: I forget.

Karen: Racism.

Ms. Gilbert: Good; can you define that, in case anyone's not sure?

Zach: They hate Jews.

Sami: Like, hatred.

Chris: Hating foreigners.

Ms. Gilbert: [not noting this on board] I don't think...

Jim: Hitler.

Chris: Skinheads.

Ms. Gilbert [writing each on the board]: That's some of it.

Carlos: Germany.

Lori: What about war? [Ms. Gilbert: Which war?] The one with Hitler. Two.

Greg: Swastika. [Ms. Gilbert begins to draw one on the board, falters; Chris takes the chalk and draws it for her.]

Sami: Concentration camps.

Ms. Gilbert: Who can tell something they know about concentration camps (January 5, period 5).

The lesson went on, eventually drawing more than half of the class into the discussion, with the teacher clarifying the historical and ideological context of Nazism in 1930s Germany before returning to the current issue of neonazism in Germany and in the United States. Coincidentally, on this day a student brought in and passed around a chunk that his brother had chiseled off the newly opened Berlin Wall. In response to Joel's question when the object was passed to him, Ms. Gilbert told the class when the wall was erected and reviewed a few events in world history that had occurred since World War II. Sami wanted to know why the wall had spray paint on only one side. The teacher took this opportunity to use the Berlin Wall (with its graffiti art on only the western side) as a graphic representation of the idea of freedom. Toward the end of the period, Ms. Gilbert told the class:

I want you to understand that [Nazism] affected all of you. There were lots and lots of Jews killed, but there were many, many others, too; anybody who wasn't so-called Aryan, who didn't fit one particular ideal of the good German (January 5, period 5).

This example seems to typify a particular approach to inclusion applied across time and space. In her pedagogical process, Sarah used a strategy that included student voices in the production as well as in the evaluation of knowledge. In her lesson's substantive content, she set a general agenda but followed student interests, building bridges to access their range of prior knowledge. Sarah facilitated a discourse that appeared to broaden that knowledge, by highlighting the contrast among viewpoints and by reinforcing the idea and names of multiple actors on the historical stage. The explicit message of her lesson was that racism, hatred, and anti-Semitism are morally wrong and should be resisted. Tolerance was taught, although not necessarily practiced through particular skills.

An earlier lesson illustrates the problem of tolerance. At times, several of Sarah's students openly resisted her viewpoint regarding crosscultural issues. It should be noted, however, that in the process they practiced asserting their own rights in a conflictual context. As often happened, the teacher facilitated a discussion that began with a topic initiated by a student. The unusual aspect of this incident, however, was the emotional tenor students expressed on the social studies topic of the unplanned debate that followed.

Brian gave an oral report that had been carried over from the earlier unit on U.S. geography. He told about Montgomery, Alabama, where he had lived for a year with his family. He described how "the culture's really different." "Religion's really important there," for example, and "There's no Mexican food at all there except Taco Bell!" He described separate black and white neighborhoods, racially based fights, the ubiquitous Confederate flag, and an attitude of white supremacy. Sarah Gilbert picked up on the topic Brian had raised by telling her own story, that antiracism involved making political choices about one's own behavior. She told the class that she had once accepted price bids for roofing work: She had chosen not to hire one of the low bidding contractors partly on the basis of the Confederate flag he displayed on his belt buckle. To her, living in a northern context, the flag was a symbol of racism.

The teacher's story set off a loud and emotional discussion, beginning when Robert hotly asserted that the Confederate flag didn't necessarily signify racism. Glen asked, "Isn't that discrimination, to not hire somebody just because of a flag?" Every student was on the edge of his/her seat, and most were talking, both to their neighbors and to the whole group. The loudest and most frequent voices were four white boys

who were normally very reluctant participants in academic activity. These four aggressively challenged the teacher's viewpoint. Once the discussion was going, Sarah concentrated on her facilitator role, calling on louder students to pause and give others a chance on the floor, asking questions, reframing, and clarifying issues that emerged (October 27, period 4).

After the bell rang, Sarah told me, "I like controversy, even when it makes them mad. It gets them thinking" (interview, October 27).

I saw two things in this episode. First, conflict in the curricular content definitely resulted in (made possible practice with) conflict in the pedagogical process. In a positive sense, this conflict generated a high level of participation, even among generally timid, resistant, or uninterested students. There were a few students—particularly those in this class who rarely completed coursework and who were receiving low grades—who only spoke up or appeared interested when opposing viewpoints were aired. In a more negative sense, openness to conflict made classroom control and efficient coverage of unfamiliar course content more difficult.

Second, this conflictual discussion clearly stimulated thought and interest for some students. Even during the wildest part of the lesson, students were making and refuting arguments, presenting and evaluating evidence, and responding to new information and unfamiliar perspectives with relevant ideas. Students left the room still discussing the issue so actively that the fifth-period class came in after lunch already talking about it. Using Avery's definition, tolerance requires a direct encounter with something potentially intolerable; i.e., a problem involving a disliked person or group (1992). In this lesson, most students were engaged in practicing some of the skills associated with tolerance.

Students at times resisted the kinds of inclusive participatory demands made by Sarah; for example, few participated actively in some class discussions (this was true in Ruth's classes as well, although her curriculum was intended to emphasize content over participation). Sarah discussed this problem in an interview one day when she had experienced difficulty engaging students in concentrated open-minded thinking and dialogue. After one particularly sluggish lesson on global environmental destruction, Sarah reflected:

I've been thinking a lot about it, and I've finally decided that the reason the students are bored and not doing so well is that what we've been covering is too diffuse. You know, the global village and all that. I think they'll do better if [the subjects covered are] more specific. So, tomorrow we'll begin

a unit on Japan; then we'll do China, then India, and then we'll see (interview, February 20).

Sarah's reflections on the subject bring up some important issues regarding inclusive educational practice. Conflictual discussion methods, especially those that try to involve a wide spectrum of students who each understand the subject differently, can easily seem diffuse, as Sarah put it. A teacher needs knowledge of both pedagogy and subject matter to choose and represent key issues and to manage a participatory discussion that can inform and illustrate ideas. It is so much easier, in terms of planning and predictability, to lecture, to drill, or to rely upon the contributions of the top students. If these pedagogical difficulties are evident when curricular content is monocultural and consensual, then they are even more so when content is conflictual and also conceptually difficult; hence, when it is personally or politically risky.

Sarah Gilbert engaged her students in a process of active learning that appeared to model skills and attitudes associated with democratic citizenship, including the practice of dissent in a pluralistic environment. She explained her curricular strategy to the students: "In this class, I try to give you more freedoms than you might get in some other classes, because I know that this class is where you practice taking responsibility" (February 8). This emphasis on inclusive practice, however, does not imply that all students did participate regularly any more than in other teachers' classes. Furthermore, the subject matter that Sarah's students were held accountable for in graded homework and on tests did not reflect the inclusion of conflicting perspectives evident in their discussions. Sarah's curriculum, therefore, may have led some students to see themselves as democratic decision makers without substantially broadening their understanding of pluralistic ideas.

Citizenship Education in a Pluralistic Society

The inclusion of students from diverse backgrounds in the process of becoming full and active (democratic) citizens is an essential goal of social studies education, but educators have different views of how to reach that goal. Each teacher's classroom is a laboratory for modeling and practicing behaviors relevant to citizenship. Like any laboratory, the classroom is not the same as the outside world, but it reflects an attempt to explain and to shape that world. Experienced social studies teachers Ruth Murray and Sarah Gilbert implemented the same curricular guidelines differently, reflecting their own interpretations of what is essential to citizenship education. Partly as a result of the ways they handled and avoided conflict in their curricula, the two teachers in these case studies presented different images of the active citizens who share

the power to govern in this society. By extension, they presented different views of their students' various roles as citizens.

Learning Inclusion

Teachers like Ruth present a relatively broad range of people as knowers and doers in society, and ask their students to understand information about those citizens' beliefs and origins. Ruth reflected the idea that students would learn inclusion by understanding how an inclusive set of people were important and how their conflicting viewpoints had shaped and strengthened society. She felt that students should achieve this content background prior to active, informed participation in society, and that school classrooms were uniquely suited to provide this necessary prerequisite of information.

I think I run a very tight class, in control, so they don't have much opportunity to disagree with each other. Maybe that's too bad....In the total picture of what's important for humanity, I think it's more important to have people respect each other's opinions, [but] in our culture, people are expected to have a certain core of knowledge. Maybe the purpose of education is to transmit the background, so that the questions can be asked [at a later time] (interview, January 5).

Ruth saw broadening student knowledge as the basis for future participation, and she felt that school classrooms are uniquely suited to this information transmission role.

Inclusion in Learning

A teacher like Sarah requires her students to practice being knowers and doers by taking and defending diverse viewpoints in the classroom. Since curricular time is inevitably limited, this skill building occurred somewhat at the expense of broadening student conceptual and informational backgrounds. Sarah reflected the idea that only students included in learning would develop the skills, confidence, and motivation to continue learning, to remember unfamiliar information, and to participate in the wider political society. Sarah felt that this engagement and guided practice with nonviolent conflict management would provide a framework for later acquisition of information in specific contexts; she also felt that school classrooms were the only place that provided students with this practice-centered education.

Different Lessons in the Same Classroom

In each classroom, some students were practicing the knowledge and skills for active citizenship far more than others. The most striking

similarity among these two classrooms was the persistent silence among large numbers of students. Even in rousing discussions where it seemed to both the teacher and the observer that virtually everyone was involved, perhaps one third to two thirds of the students actually participated. The same names appeared in my field notes consistently as speakers. These students were practicing the skills and self-concept associated with having a voice and with being heard. Their peers whose voices I rarely heard were practicing a different role and a different view of themselves as members of society. Exploratory study in so few classrooms does not provide reliable data regarding the ethnic, economic, or gender identity of these silent students; future research is needed in this area. The impressions I gathered, however, after several months of observation certainly seem to affirm the research of others that status inequality in the classroom substantially reflects status inequality in society.

In a social studies course especially, the social norms and skills that students witness and practice are as crucial as the information that is disseminated. The opportunity to interact with peers in a competitive school environment—perhaps reinforcing one student's sense of entitlement and confidence and another's sense of alienation and reticence—can serve to confirm and to rigidify rather than to challenge student expectations regarding peer superiority and inferiority (Cohen, 1986). The hidden curriculum of even a well-intentioned teacher may favor exclusion.

By high school, students who feel alienated, timid, or unable to take risks have learned to melt into corners, to fit in, and to avoid attention. I do not mean to suggest that verbal participation is everything; students learn by observing models as well as by practicing. But if it is somehow true that a vast underclass of students cannot or will not speak up to assert their opinions or needs even in the protected context of their social studies classrooms, then surely this experience is teaching them about their eventual roles as passive citizens in society.

For many silent students, there is a mismatch between the codes used by the dominant culture (represented by the teacher, the textbook, and the implemented curriculum) and their own comfortable, indigenous discourse patterns. This difference in communication patterns may cause both crosscultural misunderstanding and a divergence of educational goals.

Many liberal educators hold that the primary goal for education is for children...to develop fully who they are in the classroom setting without having arbitrary outside standards forced upon them. This is a very reasonable goal for people whose children are already participants in the culture of power and who have already internalized its

codes. But parents who don't function within that culture often want something else....They want to ensure that the school provides their children with discourse patterns, interactional styles, and spoken and written language codes that will allow them success in the larger society (Delpit, 1988, p. 285).

Ruth Murray's curriculum seems in many ways to respond to Delpit's theory. She asked her students to practice more difficult or at least different cognitive skills than Sarah did; she asked them to extend their ideas further by requiring a substantial and tightly structured body of prior knowledge and analytical work, and not simply by allowing students to speak freely. To make this learning possible for a broad range of students, Ruth was consistently explicit in the codes she used, both in describing subject-matter content and in guiding student behavior in pedagogical activities. Lower status students are not necessarily incorporated as active citizens through extracurricular means. Where will they learn these codes for participation, if not in school? Further research is required to explore the possibility that a more demanding (and more substantively conflictual) social studies curricula may, if material is clearly presented and explained, give lower status students a more thorough background and thus a better opportunity for future participation as citizens.

Metz showed in the context of a newly desegregated school that conflictual, less predictable, and public pedagogy (as opposed to lecture or individual seatwork, in which students are more isolated from one another) was particularly difficult for lower status or culturally different students (1978). This is in keeping with Delpit's theory and with Ruth's approach to that dilemma. It is difficult to gauge such an impact reliably from my case studies because Ruth did not facilitate discussions comparable to those that Sarah inspired. Sometimes I observed exasperated looks, confusion, unusual participation, or obvious interest among the students, but without further research it is impossible to draw systematic conclusions about what occurs to lower status students when they are asked to confront conflict in their social studies courses. It is reasonable to assume, however, that most adolescent students, especially those of lower social status, are reluctant to risk exposing themselves to embarrassment in front of peers and a teacher, and that it is difficult for many students to take points of view that might differ from influential peers.

In the open participatory environment of Sarah's class, many students did feel free to express almost anything, including occasional rude or ethnocentric remarks. Sarah handled most of these with brief and gentle reminders regarding ground rules for respectful behavior. This

maintained the hum of academic activity in the class. One Monday, however, Sarah approached me with the following story:

I wanted to tell you that I read them the riot act after things just got totally out of hand on Wednesday. They were unable to settle down at all for the [European geography] quiz....[After the quiz] they were watching a video about what's going on in Czechoslovakia and they were laughing, just because the people were speaking Czech. Finally, I'd just had it....[On Thursday, I came in mad and made a speech about] limits on behavior, respect for differences, the whole global village thing....I feel that it worked. Things are better (interview, December 4).

Delpit would point out that in the above instance, Sarah resorted to a less ambiguous style of authoritative interaction in order to make the boundaries of classroom interaction clearer to more of her students.

While practice with conflict in school may be important preparation for citizenship in the real political world, classrooms often remain segregated from that world. Democratic participation inside the classroom laboratory as well as out in the real world requires skills that can only be developed with practice. Some students learn to participate from models and practice outside of school; other students do not have this cultural capital, and therefore must rely on schools to provide their only opportunity to learn these skills. McNeil's finding that students as well as teachers were not used to divergent questioning is well supported by my case studies (1986, pp. 144-145). When given the opportunity to discuss an issue critically, some students (in both McNeil's cases and mine) were troubled and resistant, while others who were presumably more confident seized the opportunity with enthusiasm and occasionally with the reckless abandon that many teachers apparently feared.

A generation ago, Weiler pointed out that "the individual's ability to cope with dissent and conflict [is important to] the system's ability to manage such conflict," and concluded that political socialization research should pay attention to the positive value of conflict and tolerance for conflict as an educational outcome (1972, p. 62). People with high social status generally feel and act entitled to dissent and disagreement; for them, conflict in classroom social studies may be less essential to their eventual roles in society. Dissent from below, however, is more difficult to achieve, yet more essential to the democratic ideal because of the suspicion such challenges often generate. Presenting and practicing the management of ideological alternatives in social studies education presents the holders of both viewpoints as knowers; it presents criticism and invention of alternatives as legitimate endeavors for citizens of all

social strata. Instead of being excluded for believing differently, dissenters and others outside the mainstream are portrayed and received as valued citizens.

Public school, in the mixed-income and multiethnic neighborhoods of high schools such as West and East, is an arena in which a wider range of citizens could learn both the skills and the knowledge for constructive democratic participation, including dissent and the international and multicultural understanding essential to pluralism. The wisdom of practice demonstrated by the teachers discussed here gives us a better understanding of what kinds of citizenship education are possible in urban classrooms, and of what skills and strategies it would take to truly teach inclusion.

References

- AEGIS, Global Educators, las Palomas de Taos, and the Stanley Foundation (1989, April). *Quality global/international education: What political stance* [Summary report of conference]. Muscatine, IA: Author.
- Anderson, L. (1979). *Schooling and citizenship in a global age*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Anyon, J. (1979). Ideology and U.S. history textbooks. *Harvard Educational Review*, 49(3), 361-386.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 3-42.
- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Avery, P. G. (1988). Political tolerance among adolescents. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 16(2), 183-201.
- Avery, P. G. (1992, April). *Do all of the people have all of the rights all of the time?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting.
- Bandura, R. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Banks, J. (1990). Citizenship education for a pluralistic democratic society. *The Social Studies*, 81(5), 210-214.
- Barbagli, M. & Dei, M. (1977). Socialization into political apathy and subordination. In J. Karabel & A. Halsey (Eds), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 423-432). London: Oxford Press.
- Becker, J. (1990). Curriculum considerations in global studies. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action* (pp. 67-85). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berlak, A. & Berlak, H. (1981). *Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change*. London: Methuen.
- Bickmore, K. (1991). *Practicing conflict: Citizenship education in high school social studies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Bickmore, K. (1993). Conflict matters: Teaching about peace in the social studies curriculum. *Thresholds in Education*, 19(3), 25-33.
- Boulding, E. (1988). *Building a global civic culture: Education for an interdependent world*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction: In education, society, and culture*. London: Sage.
- Brock-Utne, B. (1989). *Feminist perspectives on peace and peace education*. New York: Pergamon.
- California State Department of Education. (1987). *History-social science framework for California public schools*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- Carnoy, M. & Levin, H. (1985). *Schooling and work in the democratic state*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cohen, E. G. (1986). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for heterogeneous classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crichlow, W., Goodwin, S., Shakes, G., & Swartz, E. (1991). Multicultural ways of knowing: Implications for practice. *Boston Journal of Education*, 172(2), 101-117.
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19(1), 63-71.
- Dawson, R., Prewitt, K., & Dawson, K. (1977). *Political socialization*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280-298.
- Deutch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Duggan, S., Grossman, D., & Thorpe, D. (1986, April). *Curriculum content, instructional strategies, and classroom climate: Classroom observations of global education*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting.
- Ehman, L. (1970). Normative discourse and attitude change in the social studies classroom. *High School Journal*, 54 (2), 76-83.
- Ehman, L. (1980). The American school in the political socialization process. *Review of Educational Research*, 50 (1), 99-120.
- Erickson, F. (1972, April). *What makes school ethnography ethnographic?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting.

- Eyler, J. (1980). Citizenship education for conflict. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 8(2), 11-26.
- Festinger, L. (1964). *Conflict, decision, and dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fine, M. (1987). Silencing in public schools. *Language Arts*, 64(2), 157-174.
- Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Goldenson, D. (1978). An alternative view about the role of the secondary school in political socialization. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6(1), 44-72.
- Goodlad, J. (1985). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Grossman, D. L. (1976). *Educational climates and attitudes toward dissent: A study of political socialization of conflict norms in adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University: Stanford, CA.
- Harwood, A. (1991, April). *The difference between 'Democracy sucks' and 'I may become a politician': Views from three high school civics classes*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting.
- Horton, M. & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Jencks, C. (1985). How much do high school students learn? *Sociology of Education*, 58 (2), 128-135.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1979). Conflict in the classroom: Controversy and learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(1), 51-69.
- Joy, C. (1990). *Believing is seeing: Attitudes and assumptions that affect learning about development*. New York: National Clearinghouse on Development Education.
- Kelly, G. P. & Nihlen, A. S. (1982). Schooling and the reproduction of patriarchy. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education* (pp. 162-180). London: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). The multicultural mission: Unity and diversity. *Social Education*, 56 (5), 308-310.
- Lamy, S. L. (1991). Global education: A conflict of images. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From thought to action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Liben, L. S. (1987). Approaches to development and learning: Conflict and congruence. In L. Liben (Ed.), *Development and learning: Conflict or congruence* (pp. 237-252). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lincoln, A. (1990). We proposed to give 'all' a chance. In M. Cuomo & H. Holzer (Eds.), *Lincoln on democracy* (pp. 62-63). New York: HarperCollins.

- McCarthy, C. (1988). Rethinking liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 265-279.
- McNeil, L. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Merelman, R. M. (1990). The role of conflict in children's political learning. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Political socialization, citizenship education and democracy* (pp. 47-65). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Metz, M. H. (1978). *Classrooms and corridors*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (1989). *Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Novak, M., Kirkpatrick, J., & Crutcher, A. (1978). *Values in an American government textbook: Three appraisals*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Piaget, J. (1955). *The child's construction of reality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ravitch, D. (1990). Diversity and democracy: Multicultural education in America. *American Educator*, 14(1), 16-48.
- Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Resnick, L. B. (1987). *Education and learning to think*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Rose, M. (1989). *Lives on the boundary: America's educational underclass*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Sewall, G. T. (1988). American history textbooks: Where do we go from here? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(8), 552-558.
- Shulman, J. & Mesa-Bains, A (Eds.). (1990). *Teaching diverse students: Cases and commentaries*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.
- Sigel, R. (1990). The case for educating for gender equality. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Political socialization, citizenship education, and democracy* (pp. 243-265). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(4), 421-444.
- Smith, K., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Can conflict be constructive? Controversy versus concurrence seeking in learning groups. *Journal of American Psychology*, 73(5), 651-663.
- Spender, D. & Sarah, D. (Eds.). (1988). *Learning to lose: Sexism and education*. London: Women's Press.
- Torney, J. V. (1977). The international attitudes and knowledge of adolescents in nine countries. *International Journal of Political Education*, 1(1), 3-20.
- Torney-Purta, J. (1989). Political cognition and its restructuring in young people. *Human Development*, 32(1), 14-23.

- Trecker, J. L. (1974). Women in U.S. history textbooks. In J. Stacey (Ed.), *And Jill came tumbling down: Sexism in American education* (pp. 249-268). New York: Dell.
- Weiler, H. (1972). Political socialization and the political system: Consensual and conflictual linkage concepts. In M. Kirst (Ed.), *State, school, and politics* (pp. 57-72). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Wien, B. (Ed.). (1987). *Peace and world order studies: A curriculum guide*. New York: World Policy Institute.
- Wilson, S. M. & Wineburg, S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses. *Teachers College Record*, 89(4), 525-539.

Author

KATHY BICKMORE is Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Foundations, College of Education, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115.

BOOK REVIEWS

Essay Reviews

Shaver, J. P. (Ed.). (1991). *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan. ISBN 0-02-895790, \$75.00, hardcover.

Comments from the Book Review Editor

This special section of *TRSE* presents the second and final set of essay reviews on the *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* edited by James Shaver, a project of the National Council for the Social Studies in conjunction with Macmillan Publishing Company. The first set of reviews appeared in the issue immediately preceding this one.

In this issue, individuals from reading and literacy, teacher education, and the social studies classroom present responses to chapters of the handbook.

Martha R. Ruddell is Professor of Reading at Sonoma State University. She has written numerous articles related to reading in the content areas. Her academic interest is in the field of reading and literacy. Her latest book is entitled *Teaching Content Reading and Writing* (1993), and it is published by Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

D. Rosalind Hammond is Associate Professor of Social Studies Education at Bowling Green State University. She has written numerous articles on teacher education and specializes in social studies methodology and early American folklore.

Ted W. Freeman is a social studies teacher at Terra Linda High School in San Rafael, California. He has taught U.S. history, government, and economics. He is currently a mentor teacher in the California Mentor Teacher program.

Perry M. Marker
Sonoma State University

Challenge, Perspective, and Additions

A critical review of the chapter "Reading Research and Social Studies."

MARTHA RAPP RUDELL, Sonoma State University.

"Reading Research and Social Studies" (Camperell & Knight, 1991) represents an important synthesis of theory and research in two distinctly different yet related fields. In considering the questions, "How does this synthesis reflect your thinking as a professional in reading and language development?" and "How does it resonate with what you're doing and what you know the field to be about?" my short answer is, "Pretty well." Camperell and Knight use a prominent and well-known theory of reading as the basis for their analysis, synthesize a significant body of reading research from the past decade and a half, and provide a cogent summary of reading research findings and conclusions that have implications for social studies education. Throughout, Camperell and Knight highlight significant ideas (the role of prior knowledge in learning), identify areas of concern (the predominance of adult rather than child and adolescent populations in much reading research), and address important issues (the paucity of reading research specific to social studies learning). In the long answer that follows, I shall: (1) challenge one of Camperell and Knight's most important assertions; (2) explore a new perspective for viewing general versus domain-specific social studies and reading research; and (3) suggest additional reading/language theory to augment or perhaps elaborate the schema-theoretic viewpoint that Camperell and Knight present.

I should mention that I find it increasingly difficult to refer only to reading when I discuss literacy, and I find it just as difficult to consider reading in the social studies apart from writing in the social studies. I simply cannot separate reading from writing and other language processes, and am convinced of the parallel role that reading and writing play in social studies (and other subject area) learning. Current theoretical and research literature reflects this broader view, as do professional journals. The *Journal of Reading Behavior*, for example, a quarterly published by the National Reading Conference, added in the mid-1980s the subtitle *A Journal of Literacy* to signify its widening perspective. For the remainder of this article, I shall refer to literacy, reading/language processes, or reading and writing in my discussion.

A Challenge

I begin by challenging Camperell's and Knight's early statement that "reading educators often base their recommendations [to social studies teachers] on skills models of reading that are outmoded because they present a static conception of reading" (p. 567). While I agree that skills models are outmoded, I can find very little evidence to support the notion that reading educators often rely on such models in their discussions of subject area reading and writing. Virtually all of the predominant theories of reading over the past decade and a half have emphasized the role of prior knowledge in reading, and throughout this time period these theories have focused increasingly on the view that readers *construct* (rather than *get*) meaning as the result of interactions with text (Anderson, 1984; Bransford, 1985; Goodman, 1985, in press; Rosenblatt, 1978, in press; Ruddell & Speaker, 1985; Ruddell & Unrau, in press; Rumelhart, 1985; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). These theories, anchored as they are in a schema-theoretic position, simply cannot be viewed as skills models, even though they represent a range of viewpoints regarding the relative influence of separate skills in reading. Those theories that do highlight reading skills (Adams, 1990; Ehri, 1991; LaBerge & Samuels, 1985; Samuels, in press) focus almost completely on the beginning-to-read stages of the reading process, and always emphasize the importance of readers arriving at meaning. Never do these theories suggest direct transfer of a skills model of reading onto literacy instruction in subject areas.

My challenge here also includes evidence from both the texts and the instructors in classes that educate social studies teachers with regard to reading, writing, and other language processes (e.g., courses such as Teaching in the Content Areas, Teaching Reading in Middle and Secondary Schools, and Teaching Reading in Elementary Schools). Many textbooks for such classes have the words *content area* in the title, particularly those intended for subject area teachers in middle grades and above. Others are general reading/language arts texts intended for elementary teachers and have a major section on content reading. A survey of a number of widely used and recent texts in elementary, middle, and secondary school reading/language pedagogy (Atwell, 1987; Lapp, Flood, & Farnam, 1989; Mason & Au, 1990; Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 1989; Roe, Stoodt, & Burns, 1991; Ruddell, 1993; Vacca & Vacca, 1993; Vacca, Vacca, & Gove, 1991) reveals that these texts present in various ways and degrees the meaning-construction, schema-theoretic, and interactive theories discussed above. It therefore seems highly reasonable that faculty using such texts would reflect this theoretical viewpoint, and that instructional strategies recommended for social studies teaching would be similarly consistent. I quite simply do not know of anyone who uses a skills model

to support what they say to elementary, middle, and secondary school social studies teachers, and even those who may present a stronger skills approach than I might for beginning reading instruction at elementary levels do not apply a skills model to subject area literacy instruction.

It seems to me that reading/language educators' use of skills models is not the central issue here. The real issue in my mind is one that Camperell and Knight identify later (p. 568): the very large and substantive gap that exists between what reading and social studies educators (those whom Camperell and Knight refer to as university professors) say to social studies teachers about social studies and reading/language pedagogy, and what social studies teachers *do* in their elementary and secondary classrooms. This is the real issue, one which both reading/language educators and social studies educators need to work together to resolve. In fact, my extended discussion here reflects my ardent belief that if we start with the premise that reading/language educators are telling social studies teachers the wrong stuff because they (the reading/language educators) don't know the right stuff, then we establish an unnecessary and I believe unwarranted theoretical and pedagogical division between reading/language and social studies educators, and we also obscure the fact that many social studies teachers in elementary, middle, and secondary schools are not listening to *any* of us. The evidence I have suggests that reading educators and social studies educators are basing what they say to social studies teachers on highly similar or at the very least highly congruent learning theories (Martorella, 1991; Ruddell, 1993; Vacca & Vacca, 1993). If we wish to reduce the gap between recommended and actual practice, we as reading/language and social studies educators need to initiate and sustain conversations with one another, find ways to make our voices stronger and more clearly unified, and increase our effectiveness in helping student and experienced teachers apply what we have taught them in their classrooms.

A Perspective

Camperell and Knight raise the very important issue of generalized versus domain-specific viewpoints regarding development of literacy abilities in subject areas. They state:

Perhaps the most controversial area in reading research is whether and how contextual variables are related to strategy development. Can skills such as problem solving, reasoning, or comprehension be developed in isolation from the domains of knowledge in which they are used (p. 569).

We used to discuss this issue under the rubric transfer of training, and we have spent considerable time debating whether human beings learning a skill in one context would automatically transfer and apply that skill in other more specific contexts; i.e., after becoming good readers and writers, will students automatically be good readers and writers in social studies? We have never answered this question very satisfactorily, nor have we addressed systematically the intersection between general and domain-specific literacy and learning strategies (the point made by Camperell and Knight). Camperell and Knight later conclude:

Most research on reading/study strategies has been focused on general rather than domain-specific skills, and interactions between knowledge of specific content domains and strategy development have, for the most part, been ignored (p. 571).

This situation is partly due to the fact that the language processes reading/language researchers examine are common to literacy in all subject areas; consequently, we actively seek to replicate research and generalize results across subject area domains. An additional factor here is the way reading/language and social studies researchers alike frame the fundamental question. When we ask, will students who are good readers and writers be good readers and writers in social studies, the question itself assumes an either/or, linear result; i.e., either they will or they won't. The fact is that literacy processes and social studies learning are sufficiently complex and interrelated to suggest that questions and analyses regarding their relationship must be similarly complex. We have substantial evidence that general reading ability, age, instructional practice, and any number of other factors interact with and influence student effectiveness in using specific literacy and learning strategies or applying such strategies to specific subject areas (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; cf. Camperell & Knight, Tables 48-2 & 48-3). Any attempt to understand literacy processes in social studies learning must account for the many physical, social, psycholinguistic, lexical, and situational contexts that shape these interacting factors and the processes themselves.

To move us beyond our current discussion, I propose that we begin with a different question—adopt a new perspective, if you will. The question I propose we ask is this: What are the reading/writing and other language strategies that assist students in learning social studies? This question assumes complexity and suggests further that cooperative research efforts are required. Let us examine the language and literacy strategies useful for learning in social studies by starting with what we already know about two literacy processes widely acknowledged as

critical aspects of reading: comprehension and vocabulary. From these general findings, we may then begin to draw conclusions and develop research agendas for understanding effective literacy specific to the social studies domain.

In their review of reading comprehension research conducted over the decade of the 1980s, Pearson, Roehler, Dole, and Duffy (1990) found that *thoughtful readers* use the following comprehension strategies:

- 1) They constantly search for connections between what they know and what they encounter as new information in the text.
- 2) They constantly monitor the adequacy of the models of text meaning that they build.
- 3) They take steps to repair faulty comprehension once they realize they failed to understand something.
- 4) They learn very early to distinguish important from less important concepts in the texts they read.
- 5) They are especially adept at synthesizing information within and across texts and reading experiences.
- 6) They make inferences during and after reading to achieve a full, integrated understanding of the text material.
- 7) They sometimes consciously and almost always unconsciously ask questions of themselves, the authors they encounter, and the texts they read (p. 13).

In a review of the literature in vocabulary acquisition and development and in an exploration of the vocabulary-comprehension relationship, I arrived at the following conclusions regarding vocabulary learning (Ruddell, in press):

- 1) Words are known on a variety of levels and in gradients of understanding; similarly, words are learned in a more or less gradual way over time.
- 2) Individuals have well-developed, personalized strategies for learning new words by the time they reach adulthood.
- 3) Instruction directed toward teaching students new words is by and large highly successful.
- 4) Rather compelling evidence exists that students acquire strategies for learning and remembering words successfully, but we have almost no understanding of how or if students systematically and selectively apply these strategies while reading and learning.

- 5) Substantial evidence suggests that readers spontaneously use context to construct meaning from text.
- 6) Exploration of the influence of social interactions on word learning is just beginning.

Camperell and Knight call for a new emphasis on domain-specific research. I urge that any such efforts build upon our accumulated knowledge base, and that efforts be collaborative between social studies and reading/language educators. We already know a great deal about what good readers and writers do. It seems utterly reasonable to me that beginning with accrued knowledge about literacy processes and social studies learning, social studies and reading/language educators could work together for the purpose of initiating discussion and developing a joint research agenda regarding the language and literacy strategies that promote learning in social studies.

Additions

It is, I suppose, only human to overlay one's own viewpoint and knowledge onto text when reading other work (actually, current theory and research suggest that this is precisely what readers do). And so I wish to end my commentary on Camperell's and Knight's analysis of reading and the social studies by adding three aspects of literacy they did not address that I believe are important to learning in the social studies: transaction, intertextuality, and social context.

Camperell and Knight point out the role of interaction in schematic views of literacy processes. They note that interactions during reading involve reader, text, situational, and other factors. Louise Rosenblatt (1978) introduced the term transaction in her theory of reading and writing to emphasize the dynamic nature of the influence of the text and reader/writer on each other. She states:

Every reading act is an event, a transaction involving a particular reader and a particular text, and occurring at a particular time in a particular context. Instead of two fixed entities acting on one another, the reader and the text are rather two aspects of a total dynamic situation. The 'meaning' does not reside ready made 'in' the text or 'in' the reader, but happens, comes into being, during the transaction between reader and text (Rosenblatt, in press).

Transaction is a prominent feature in other theoretical models of the reading process (Goodman, 1985, in press; Ruddell & Unrau, in

press), and serves to highlight the constructivist nature of reading, writing, and learning. The importance of transactional theory lies in part upon its recognition that in the act of reading a common text, e.g., an assigned social studies text chapter, each reader *constructs his or her own text* based upon his/her stance in relationship to the text (including attitude, affect, and intent) and upon the interplay of many other factors. This same processing occurs as writers create text, even when they may be writing from a common reading experience. Integral to this transaction is the intertext mentally created by the reader/writer, that lies somewhere between the original source text, the reader's or writer's knowledge base, and the final text product the reader or writer produces (Hartman, 1990, 1991; Spivey & King, 1989). During reading, the reader is "transposing text into other texts, absorbing one text into another, and building a mosaic of intersecting texts" (Hartman, 1991, p. 31) as he or she uses a variety of resources to 'zig-zag' through text. Spivey and King (1989) have documented a parallel process that writers experience in creating written text. Transaction and the intertext are important additions to schema theory and serve to illuminate the manner in which readers' and writers' prior knowledge stores are activated during learning.

The influence of social context on literacy processes and learning is aptly characterized by one of the assumptions underlying the Ruddell and Unrau reading model (in press). Ruddell and Unrau state that "readers construct meaning not only of printed manuscripts, but also of events, speech, and behaviors as they *read* gestures, images, symbols, signs, and signals that are embedded in a social and cultural environment." Ruddell and Unrau place the classroom in a prominent position in their reading model, and build in explanations of how teacher decision making, cognitive and social transactions during instructional events, and social negotiations of meaning in classrooms affect student constructions of knowledge. Their model is singular in its attention to the social context of the classroom and teacher decision making, and it presents theory that is highly consonant with current widespread efforts of language and literacy researchers to examine more fully the social, environmental, and cultural influences on literacy and learning. The Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1992), a consortium of university faculty, graduate students, and classroom teachers studying literacy in classrooms, summarizes its own groundbreaking work eloquently:

Literacy, then, is not a generic process located solely within the heads of individuals, or a process that is the same for all people in all situations. Nor is literacy a state of being that one arrives at like a state of grace. Rather, it is a dynamic process in which what literate

action means is continually being constructed and reconstructed by individuals as they become members of new social groups (p. 120).

Transaction, intertextuality, and social context are constructs I believe to be critical to understanding the relationships between literacy and social studies learning. These constructs highlight the extraordinary complexity of reading and writing acts, and emphasize the dynamic interplay of many elements—the transactions, if you will—that constitute reading, writing, and learning processes. Further, they remind us forcefully that literacy and learning do not take place in the solitude of learner heads; that learning, especially in schools, is a social event; and that building on students' prior knowledge base is integrative and transactive, not merely a matter of adding to their already acquired knowledge base. Efforts to increase our understanding of relationships between literacy and learning in social studies require educators and researchers in literacy and social studies to engage in conversations and to pursue mutually productive, collaborative research ventures that acknowledge and grow from our respective areas of expertise.

References

- Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Moore, D. W. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume II* (pp. 951-983). New York: Longman.
- Anderson, R. C. (1984). Role of the reader's schema in comprehension, learning and memory. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts* (pp. 243-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Writing, reading, and learning with adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bransford J. D. (1985). Schema activation and schema acquisition: Comments on Richard C. Anderson's remarks. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (3rd ed.) (pp. 259-272). International Reading Association.
- Camperell, K. & Knight, R. S. (1991). Reading research and the social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 370-384). New York: Macmillan.
- Ehri, L. C. (1991). Development of the ability to read words. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume II* (pp. 383-417). New York: Longman.

- Goodman, K. S. (in press). Reading, writing and written texts: A transactional socio-psycholinguistic view. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Goodman, K. S. (1985). Unity in reading. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (3rd ed.) (pp. 813-840). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Hartman, D. K. (1991). *8 readers reading: The intertextual links of able readers using multiple passages*. Unpublished synthesis of doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.
- Hartman, D. K. (1990). *8 readers reading: The intertextual links of able readers using multiple passages*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1985). Toward a theory of automatic processing in reading. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (3rd ed.) (pp. 689-718). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Lapp, D., Flood, J., & Farnan, N. (1989). *Content area reading and learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Martorella, P. H. (1991). Knowledge and concept development in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 370-384). New York: Macmillan.
- Mason, J. M. & Au, K. H. (1990). *Reading instruction for today* (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Pearson, P. D., Roehler, L. R., Dole, J. A., & Duffy, G. G. (1990). *Developing expertise in reading comprehension: What should be taught? How should it be taught?* (Report No. 512). Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Center for the Study of Reading.
- Readence, J. E., Bean, T. W., & Baldwin, R. S. (1989). *Content area reading* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Roe, B. D., Stoodt, B. D., & Burns, P. C. (1991). *Secondary school reading instruction: The content areas*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (in press). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Ruddell, M. R. (in press). Vocabulary knowledge and comprehension: A comprehension-process view of complex literacy relationships. In

- R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed.). Newark, DE: IRA.
- Ruddell, M. R. (1993). *Teaching content reading and writing*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ruddell, R. B. & Unrau, N. J. (in press). Reading as a meaning construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Ruddell, R. B. & Speaker, R. B. (1985). The interactive reading process: A model. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (3rd ed.) (pp. 751-793). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Rummelhart, D. E. (1985). Toward an interactive model of reading. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (3rd ed.) (pp. 722-750). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Samuels, S. J. (In press). Toward a theory of automatic processing in reading revisited. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.) *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group. (1992). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In H. H. Marshall (Ed.), *Redefining student learning: Roots of educational change* (pp. 119-150). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Shaver, J. P. (1991). *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan.
- Spivey, N. N., & King, J. R. (1989). Readers as writers composing from sources. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24, 7-26.
- Vacca, R. T. & Vacca, J. L. (1993). *Content area reading* (4th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Vacca, R. T., Vacca, J. L., & Gove, M. K. (1991). *Reading and learning to read* (2nd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies for discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

So Many Questions, So Few Answers

A critical review of the section "Teachers in Social Studies Education."

D. ROSALIND HAMMOND, Bowling Green State University.

Before I share my response to this section of the handbook, I must first clarify the lens through which I viewed these chapters. My remarks center around the utilitarian value of this information to fellow social studies educators, especially teacher educators. As one who believes that there must be a strong link between research and practice, however unclear that link may seem at times, I have also paid special attention to the potential merits present for the social studies teacher educators whose instructional responsibilities include undergraduate social studies methods courses for future elementary and secondary teachers and graduate courses for experienced social studies teachers returning for advanced education.

Overview

The chapters in this section cover a wide range of topics and approaches regarding existing research on the teaching of social studies and the characteristics of those who engage in this instruction. The section begins with a chapter outlining changing conceptions of research on social studies teaching and suggesting a research agenda to reflect with current changes in social studies educational practice (Armento, 1991). The focus on the evolution of social studies research establishes an appropriate framework for the issues addressed in other chapters in the section. The historical perspective provided by Cuban provides insight into social studies instruction, especially by analyzing the role that incremental change has had within social studies, a discipline best characterized by stability rather than change (Cuban, 1991). Research regarding the social studies teacher addresses the education and preparation that these teachers receive, their demographic characteristics, their cognitive style and moral development, their role as curricular-instructional gatekeepers, and their competence for the social studies (Adler, 1991; Leming, 1991; Thornton, 1991; Stanley, 1991).

Relevant Information

While I may take issue with individual conclusions drawn relative to several studies or with the amount of emphasis placed on certain topics, overall I found the section to be of merit. For many social studies teacher educators, it provides information that may not be new but is of vital importance to their discipline; for example, while Armento acknowledges the serious problems facing social studies instruction today, she describes new theoretical frameworks and research approaches that generate a spirit of optimism even when confronted with overwhelming obstacles (Armento, 1991). This perspective may prove very beneficial to social studies educators attempting to address these problems. Also, by focusing on several changes in the social studies teacher population, such as more highly educated teachers, increased teacher autonomy, greater protection in the academic freedom of teachers (Cuban, 1991), as well as on the view among social studies teachers of their responsibility as transmitter of societal values to students (Leming, 1991), social studies educators may be better able to examine comprehensively the current issues facing today's teachers. Other important factors discussed in this section include the teacher's cognitive style considering field dependence/independence, abstractness/concreteness and degree of tolerance; level of moral development (Leming, 1991); and ability as gatekeeper and curricular/instructional decision maker (Thornton, 1991).

Unanswered Questions

I found the handbook to be most beneficial for teacher educators, and this section is intriguing for what it did not say as well as for what it did say. Many of the issues facing social studies teacher educators have been ignored largely by researchers, or have been addressed in studies whose findings may be questioned in terms of methodology and/or theoretical grounding. More questions are raised about the nature of social studies teaching and the social studies teacher than are answered. When looking holistically at this section, it is very apparent how little is known from research about social studies education. Certain fundamental questions that have long concerned social studies educators emerge from the analysis of the existing research. First and foremost, the primary question of critical importance is how social studies educators view learning. What is the nature of learning? Is there a uniqueness about the learning process in the social studies? What do teachers believe about how students think and learn? Does a teacher's learning style impact the learning styles of students? Are social studies teachers reflective practitioners? These are

but a few of the questions related to the learning process that come to mind as one reads this section.

Also, the survey of existing research reveals that there is no commonly agreed-upon definition of social studies. When one looks for a precise meaning of social studies, one discovers many diverse interpretations. Even the National Council of the Social Studies, whose respective committees and members have spent many long hours with this issue, has not generated an exact definition of social studies; rather, it has indicated a focus on citizenship and its development through such general areas of study as represented in the *Essentials of the Social Studies* (1981). This general approach to the meaning of social studies raises additional concerns; for example, the primary interest of social studies teachers who view the purpose of social studies as citizenship education is how citizenship is defined and how teachers determine whether their students are learning the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values necessary to be effective citizens in a changing world. Other questions should include: How important are issues of nonobservable teacher practice to the effectiveness of learning citizenship skills? Do social studies teachers share core values that are unique to social studies teachers? Is a person drawn to the social studies by shared values?

Other themes evident in this section and throughout the handbook are the general lack of research in social studies and the lack of a centralized, organized approach/framework for conducting social studies research. Many teachers operate on an experiential basis rather than according to a theoretical approach. They do what they do because they think it is right, but they often have very little research to support their practices and they seem not to engage in gathering such needed knowledge. Teachers operate on an intuitive level rather than espouse a particular theoretical foundation for their practices; therefore, the absence of both a sound theoretical base and the knowledge gained through systematic research may contribute to the perpetuation of ineffective teaching practices in social studies classrooms.

Related to the lack of research in general is a lack of research on critical issues in social studies education. Issues such as cultural diversity, gender, and character education require much more attention than has been given. Also, realizing the concrete problems that teachers face in the elementary, secondary, and university classrooms due to the political, social, and/or economic pressures that shape educational policy, the demand for additional research becomes even more acute; for example, given the reality of many secondary social studies classes with 40 or more students, how do teacher education programs prepare future social studies teachers for the instructional demands of these classrooms? Individualization may become a moot

point for the social studies teacher whose total student enrollment is 240 on a given day.

Another issue that requires further study is the existing surplus of secondary social studies teachers in many geographical areas. Are our best and brightest new teachers gaining employment? Other concerns emerge regarding the social studies teacher, including the knowledge, skills, and values that social studies educators possess as both instructional leaders and expert curriculum developers and the relationship between effective curricular/instructional gate-keeping and instructional leadership. After reading this section, teacher educators may want to discuss some of the following questions:

- What exactly are we doing as social studies educators to promote effective instruction and curriculum development and why?
- How successful are we?
- How will we know that students have benefitted from the learning obtained in social studies classes today?
- What is the desired balance between studies in the social sciences and humanities and studies in education with related field experiences in a social studies teacher preparation program?
- How best can we prepare future social studies teachers?

A major effort is needed by social studies teachers and teacher educator practitioners to conduct research into issues such as those above.

A New Research Agenda

Finally, what resounds loudly and clearly from these chapters is a call for change in our approach to research in social studies, one that may facilitate greater effectiveness in dealing with the many issues confronting social studies. It seems logical to propose that research related to social studies instruction be valuable to general education as well. Perhaps now is the time for social studies educators to assume a leadership role in addressing some of these areas. As Adler noted, "little attempt, however, has been made by researchers to build upon one another's work systematically in order to develop knowledge about the field" (Adler, 1991, p. 218).

As stated earlier, much of this comes as no surprise to social studies educators. So what is the value of this handbook in general and this section in particular if it tells us what we already know? The potential worth rests in its ability to generate a measure whereby social studies educators can examine their role in fostering effective social studies instruction. By reading and analyzing this and other

sections of the handbook, and by drawing upon practical experience in the schools, educators can identify issues of concern to them professionally and personally, and begin to plan how best to address these issues in an educationally meaningful manner.

The real value of this section rests not in the answers that it provides for social studies teaching but rather in the questions that it raises concerning the areas where we require answers. Its critical importance may stem from its ability to draw attention to the overwhelming demand for research in the social studies.

Call for a National Social Studies Research Clearinghouse

To facilitate the type of massive longitudinal research effort needed as evidenced by the authors here, a central clearinghouse is needed. The National Council for the Social Studies or the College and University Faculty Assembly would appear to be appropriate facilitators for the establishment of a national information bureau for parties interested in conducting research related to social studies teaching. For the void to be filled, a systematic effort must occur, and it may well require centralization. This clearinghouse could facilitate the efforts of practitioner-researchers in addressing issues such as those raised here. Perhaps the greatest legacy to emerge from the publication of the handbook could be increased dialogue among social studies educators and renewed efforts at organized comprehensive research in the social studies.

References

- Armento, B. J. (1991). Changing conceptions of research on the teaching of social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 185-196). New York: Macmillan.
- Adler, S. A. (1991). The education of social studies teachers. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 210-221). New York: Macmillan.
- Cuban, L. (1991). History of teaching in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 197-209). New York: Macmillan.
- Leming, J. L. (1991). Teacher characteristics and social studies education. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 222-236). New York: Macmillan.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1981). *Essentials of the social studies*. Washington, DC: Author.

- Stanley, W. B. (1991). Teacher competence for social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 249-262). New York: Macmillan.
- Thornton, S. J. (1991). Teacher as curricular/instructional gatekeeper in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 237-248). New York: Macmillan.

The Student in Social Studies Education: One Social Studies Teacher's Perspective

A critical review of the section "The Student in Social Studies Education."

TED FREEMAN, Terra Linda High School, San Rafael, California.

As I read this section of the handbook, I was struck by the considerable similarity of what the research reveals to what my almost 30 years of experience as a high school social studies teacher have taught me. The authors and I certainly agree that although there are many ways to teach, the teacher can improve classroom instruction using specific techniques and strategies that are guided by research. We also recognize that factors outside school greatly affect the classroom and the chance and degree of success. In writing my perspective on these summaries of research, I have limited my comments to three chapters to which my teaching experience is most relevant. They are Chapter 11, "Adolescents' Social, Cognitive, and Moral Development and Secondary School Social Studies," by James A. Mackey; Chapter 12, "Culturally Diverse Students and Social Studies," by Geneva Gay; and Chapter 14, "Gifted Students and Social Studies," by James R. Delisle.

The Importance of the Research

These chapters confirm my understanding and conclusions about teaching and about the fact that classroom teachers should periodically review the latest research to verify, adjust, and extend their experience in day-to-day classroom situations. In California, teachers are allocated a certain number of days during the year for staff development. Some of that time should be allocated for study groups to update ourselves on the literature and the research that complement our classroom experience. This research also suggests that classroom teachers could benefit from observing other teachers and watching obvious and subtle student responses to classroom activities.

I further suggest that knowledge of the research on how students learn would enable the classroom teacher to try the new approaches to instruction emerging in the social studies; i.e., cooperative learning. It is obvious from the research that in many types of situations, students can and do learn more effectively from each other if groupings are properly formed and if appropriate team-building strategies are employed.

One of the great debates in public schools over the years that research can inform is how to best spend funds that the state allocates for gifted student programs. There is always great confusion over whether or not such students should be taken on special field trips for enrichment and grouped into special classes where they are out of contact with the average and low range of students so that learning can be accelerated. There is considerable research that would provide teachers, administrators, and parents with some guidance for determining the best directions to take (Renzulli in Delisle, 1991; Betts in Delisle, 1985). An awareness of the research and the types of programs that have been successful with gifted children will make social studies teachers better able to resist the pressure to steer bright students into science and math—a force that has long been part of the mentality of our society and of our educational system. The world's chances of survival might be enhanced if more gifted students entered the social sciences.

One of the benefits noted in the research on how children learn is the implication that no amount of restructuring or tinkering with the organization of a school is going to make a great difference in the classroom or have much effect on how much students learn and develop intellectually. What matters most—what is really important—is the work that students and teachers do together in the classroom, applying a successful blend of what research indicates about the shared classroom experience, and what intuition tells us. The research concentrates on educational psychology and pedagogy rather than on a sincere approach that seeks outside panaceas supposedly to solve all of the difficulties that schools face.

I was particularly pleased to see reference to Hilda Taba's research, indicating that "knowledge precedes thinking" and therefore that "teaching strategies must build upon students' factual knowledge" (Delisle, 1991, p. 178). Obviously both knowledge and process are important, and neither is the answer alone. These chapters also reveal the awareness among many researchers of the forces, pressures, values, and distractions outside school that have a great effect on the results that schools are able to achieve (Mackey, 1991, p. 136); for example, working at minimum-wage jobs may provide some real-world experience, but this takes a heavy toll in lost study time, increased absenteeism, and premature affluence, a price that outweighs the positive value of the job experience (Greenberger & Steinberg in Mackey, 1991). Jobs often have the effect of relegating school to a secondary position and greatly reducing the academic accomplishments of the students caught in the job-car-clothes trap. Some research has also focused on the fact that the infusion of sexual stimulation has a considerably distracting effect on teenagers (Tanner in Mackey, 1991; Elkind in Mackey, 1991).

In the area of adolescent political and economic thinking (Mackey, pp. 138-140) I find that some students do, to a considerable extent, become political ideologues. I have seen that by *blind tasting* (an analogy to wine sampling which involves scrambling exam items so students choose the statements most acceptable to them without knowing the political base each comes from) most students show a pattern of choosing related, consistent values from one platform or the other.

I have also found that my own 12th-grade students are receptive to and quite capable of learning economics and of understanding difficult economic concepts such as elasticity of demand, strategies employed by banks to create money, monetary and fiscal policy, and the multiplier effect. Retreating from something that I noted earlier, their jobs and real-world consumer experience appear to assist some in preparation for a real economics course. This receptiveness is also conditioned by the fact that economics is one of the few topics in high school social studies that students have not already been well exposed to at a lower grade level, and with large federal and state budget deficits, the deep recession, and the emphasis on a global economy most citizens' attention has tended to focus on the economy more than in previous years.

My experience indicates that schools and teachers play a very important role in the development of teenagers' moral and social values. In a society where teenagers see less and less of their parents and have fewer serious conversations with them, the importance of adults in the school greatly increases. Social studies teachers in particular serve as role models—as the educated, respected, reasonable adults that students come into contact with almost daily. The teacher, unlike much of the rest of society, is not afraid of teenagers (Mackey, p. 142) and is both willing and able to discuss social and ethical issues with them on a daily basis.

In this area of social and moral values development, another successful activity that I use in my economics course helps students understand the existence and the importance of rules. When we study labor, for example, we develop our classroom demand, and students (workers) and teacher (management) bargain collectively to establish the conditions of the classroom. Not only do we produce a set of rules or guidelines that make sense to both sides, but we also know why and where the rules came from; thus, we achieve a high level of compliance, and the students gain an understanding of both their rights and their obligations. This exercise shows that high school seniors are capable of rapidly moving toward and engaging in thought processes characteristic of adult thinking and understanding.

Suggestions for Future Research

Again, the research discussed in these chapters of the handbook is impressive and relevant to the social studies teacher. I would suggest that the areas researchers might concentrate on in the future are directly related to the social studies classroom. Some are related to the school in general, and some are related to specific subject areas.

Further study on the effects of outside forces on the classroom—factors such as family dysfunction, advertising, television and television programming, minimum-wage employment, ownership of cars, and premature affluence would be fruitful. It should be obvious to anyone concerned about education that schools are not completely in control of student learning as the many critics contend. There are a myriad of outside forces that greatly limit and to some extent enhance the classroom. If we are going to succeed, we must ask how these outside forces affect education and how we can deal with them.

We need research to help us better understand how to manage and turn to our advantage the fact that in the classroom of the 1990s, we tend to have a substantial mix of cultural/immigrant groups as well as established groups. It would be very productive to have in-depth surveys/interviews of experienced classroom social studies teachers detailing their insights on effective teaching methods and on materials that they use by tapping their experience and intuition and to compare research conclusions to them. Basic exploratory questions might start with some of the following: What would you list as your five or six keys to success in the classroom; what are the most effective ways of creating a classroom atmosphere where learning and thinking are considered very worthwhile; and how do you create an atmosphere in the classroom that teaches each child to succeed.

Finally, I would suggest that additional research is necessary so that we can become even more aware of how students learn and acquire wisdom and values. We also need to learn more about the effects of the ever more pervasive outside social forces on students and schools and how to deal with them. We also need evidence to help explain to a hypercritical public, press, and political establishment the difficulty of educating children in today's complex society. As social studies teachers, we must educate the public about the role they must play and the reforms that are necessary in society and in the home if schools are to be successful in educating the children of tomorrow.

References

- Delisle, J. R. (1991). Gifted students and social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan.

- Gay, G. (1991). Culturally diverse students and social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan.
- Mackey, J. A. (1991). Adolescents' social, cognitive, and moral development and secondary school social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan.

ERRATA

In William Wraga's article, "The Interdisciplinary Imperative for Citizenship Education," published in Volume XXI, Number 3, of *TRSE*, the following corrections should be noted:

Page 206, lines 18-20 should read: "Experimental schools in the Eight-Year Study employed a variety of nontraditional curricular organizations including broad fields, fusion, and core approaches."

Page 212, footnote 10, the last reference should read: "National Center for Educational Statistics, 1984."

Page 215, footnote 15, the last sentence should read: "While the former usually neglect the latter's approach, the latter usually regard the former's approach as one component of the total curriculum."

Page 218, footnote 17, line 5, the references should read: "(see for example, Allen, 1989; Evans, 1992)."

Page 220, lines 33-36 should read: "(Lounsbury, 1987; Brownlee, 1989; Brandt, 1991; George et al., 1992; Jenkins & Tanner, 1992; Natoli, 1992)."

Page 223, lines 24-28 should read: "Given the need, however, for citizen-students to be able actively to address complex problems that transcend subject boundaries, interdisciplinary organizations that purposefully promote knowledge application for the resolution of societal issues should be a vital component of the school curriculum;...."

Page 231, the second to last reference should read: "Wright, G. S. (1965). *Subject offerings and enrollments in public secondary schools*. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office."

INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS

Theory and Research in Social Education is designed to stimulate and communicate systematic research and thinking in social education. Its purpose is to foster the creation and exchange of ideas and research findings that will expand knowledge about purposes, conditions, and effects of schooling and education about society and social relations.

Conceptualizations and research from all of the social sciences, philosophy, history, and the arts are needed in clarifying thinking and practice in social education. Manuscripts are welcomed on topics such as those that follow:

- Purposes of social education;
- Models, theories, and related frameworks concerning the development, diffusion, and adoption of curricular materials;
- Instructional strategies;
- The relation of the social sciences, philosophy, history and/or the arts to social education;
- Alternative social organizations and utilizations of the school for social education;
- Comparative studies of alternative models of social education;
- Models of and research on alternative schemata for student participation and social action;
- Relationship of different pre- and in-service patterns of teacher training to social education;
- Models of the utilization of objectives in social education and related research findings;
- Implications of learning theory, child development research, socialization and political socialization research for the purposes and practice of social education;
- The relationship of different independent, explanatory variables to educational achievements in the area of learning about society and social relations;
- The social climate and cohesion of schools and other school characteristics as independent, explanatory variables predicting general achievement.

In most cases, submissions will be reviewed blind by a panel of at least three reviewers. When we send a manuscript out for review, we ask reviewers to judge the author's work in terms of six criteria:

- significance (the contribution of the manuscript to knowledge about the human condition);
- scholarship (the accuracy and thoroughness reflected);
- methodological sophistication (the adequacy of the author's research design);
- originality (the uniqueness of the manuscript);
- lucidity (the clarity of the author's writing);
- timeliness (whether or not the manuscript is up-to-date).

Submission of Manuscripts

All manuscripts submitted will be considered for publication. Manuscripts (five copies) should be addressed to:

Dr. Jack R. Fraenkel, Editor
Theory and Research in Social Education
Research & Development Center
School of Education (Burk Hall 238)
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94132.

In addition, please send a 3.5" disk containing your manuscript (including tables), formatted in Microsoft Word 4.0 or 5.0; the disk will be used in the final editing of your manuscript for publication.

Manuscripts are considered for publication with the understanding that they are original material and have not been submitted elsewhere for publication. Ordinarily, manuscripts will not be returned.

TRSE is a refereed journal. Manuscripts are sent to outside reviewers. This is a time-consuming process. Reviewers of individual manuscripts remain anonymous, although outside reviewers are identified in each issue of the journal.

Specifications for Manuscripts

All material submitted for publication must conform to the style of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association: Third Edition* (1983).

Abstract. All manuscripts should be sent with an abstract of 100-150 words.

Typescript. Manuscripts should be typed on 85 × 11-inch paper, upper and lower case, double-spaced, with 15 inch margins on all sides. Subheads should be used at reasonable intervals to break the monotony of lengthy texts. Only words to be set in italics (according to the APA style manual) should be underlined; sentence structure—not italics or

quotation marks—must be used for emphasis. Abbreviations and acronyms should be spelled out at first mention unless found as entries in their abbreviated form in *Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary* (e.g., IQ needs no explanation). Pages should be numbered consecutively.

Length. Manuscripts should typically run between 12 and 30 pages in typed length.

Author Identification

The complete title of the manuscript and the names of the author(s) should be typed on a separate sheet to assure anonymity in the review process. The first text page of the article should have the complete title of the manuscript, but no list of the author(s). Subsequent pages should carry only a running head. The first-named author or the co-author who will be handling correspondence with the editor should submit a complete address and telephone number.

Footnotes and References

Footnotes are explanations or amplifications of textual material. They are distracting to readers and expensive to set; accordingly, they should be avoided whenever possible. When they must occur, they should be typed on a separate sheet and numbered consecutively throughout the manuscript.

A *reference list* contains only those references that are cited in the text. Their accuracy and completeness are the responsibility of the author(s).

Tables, Figures, and Illustrations

The purpose of tables and figures is to present data to the reader in a clear and unambiguous manner. Authors should not describe the data in the text in such detail that illustrations or text are redundant.

Figures and tables should be keyed to the text. Tables should each be typed on a separate sheet and attached at the end of the manuscript. Figure captions also should be typed on a separate sheet. All figures and tables must be included on the Microsoft Word disk that accompanies the manuscript.

Photocopies may accompany the additional copies of the manuscript.

Book Reviews

Book Reviews (five copies) should be sent to:

Dr. Perry Marker
School of Education
Sonoma State University
1801 E. Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

The length may vary from 500 to 3,500 words. The format for the top of the first page is as follows:

Author (last name first). Date of publication (in parentheses).
Title (in italics). City of publication: Publisher, total number of
pages, list price (for both hard and softcover, if available),
ISBN #.

Reviewer's name, followed by institutional address, complete
with zip code.

Like all manuscripts, book review manuscripts should follow the
guidelines described above.

THEORY AND RESEARCH IN SOCIAL EDUCATION
Editorial Board

James L. Barth
Purdue University

Eric Luce
University of So. Mississippi

Jane Bernard-Powers
San Francisco State University

Peter H. Martorella
No. Carolina State University

Allan R. Brandhorst
University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

John R. Meyer
University of Windsor
Ontario, Canada

Ambrose Clegg
Kent State University

Merry M. Merryfield
Ohio State University

Richard A. Diem
University of Texas
at San Antonio

Stuart B. Palonsky
University of Missouri
at Columbia

James Eckenrod
San Francisco, CA

Walter C. Parker
University of Washington

Ronald Evans
San Diego State
University

Wayne Ross
State University of New York
at Binghamton

Jesus Garcia
Indiana University

Sam Shermis
Purdue University

Nancy R. King
Towson State University

Robert J. Stahl
Arizona State University

Gloria J. Ladson-Billings
University of Wisconsin

William B. Stanley
University of Delaware

Linda Levstik
University of Kentucky

Lynda Stone
University of Hawaii-Manoa

**Executive Committee of the
College and University
Faculty Assembly
1992-1993**

Wayne Ross (1993), *Chair*
SUNY-Binghamton
School of Education
P. O. Box 6000
Binghamton, NY 13902-6000
(607) 777-2478 (2727)

Margaret Laughlin (1994),
Chair-Elect
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
Program in Education
Green Bay, WI 54311
414-465-2057

Mark Schug (1992),
Immediate Past Chair
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
P. O. Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201
414-229-4842

Jeffrey Cornett (1994), *Secretary*
University of Central Florida
College of Education
Orlando, FL 32816
407-823-2161

Jane Bernard-Powers (1993)
San Francisco State University
School of Education
San Francisco, CA 94132
415-338-1562

Patricia Marshall (1995)
Elementary Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27695
919-515-3221

Mary Haas (1994)
West Virginia University
College of Education
Morgantown, WV 26506-6122
304-293-3442

Marilyn Johnston (1993)
Ohio State University
257 Arps Hall
1945 North High Street
Columbus, OH 43210
614-292-8020

Walter Parker (1995)
University of Washington
122 Miller, DQ-12
Seattle, WA 98195
206-543-6636

Linda Levstik (1995)
114 Taylor Education Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Jack Fraenkel, *Editor—TRSE*
San Francisco State University
School of Education (BH 238)
San Francisco, CA 94132
415-338-2510

**The National Council for the Social Studies
Officers 1992-1993**

Denny Schillings, *President*
Homewood-Flossmoor High School
Homewood, IL 60430
708-799-3000

Robert J. Stahl, *President-Elect*
Secondary Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-1911
602-965-7101/4601

1993 CUFA Program Chair

Dorothy Skeel
Peabody College for Teachers
Department of Teaching and Learning
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37202-0320
(615) 322-8100

Theory & Research
in Social Education

NCSS
3501 Newark Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Second Class Postage
Paid at Washington, D.C.
and additional
mailing offices